

P319.3712
B457a

THE SENATE DEBATES

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH OF THE HON. SENATOR BERNIER

ON THE

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION

LA
418
M 3 B 48

TS

OTTAWA, 25th JUNE, 1895.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER moved—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before the Senate, a Return of representations, if any, made by the Government of Manitoba, or any member thereof, to the Dominion Government, on the working of the educational system in force in the province of Manitoba, prior to the 1st of May, 1890.

He said : The continual recurrence of this Manitoba school question must, to a certain extent, be a source of some weariness to the House. It has been hanging on for so many years, and the other duties devolving upon you require so much of your attention, that I quite realize the peculiar difficulties I am placed in when approaching anew this question. On the other hand, it must be admitted that the question has to be dealt with, and as one coming from the province where the trouble arose, it falls upon me, more than upon anybody else, to be the exponent of the grievance and of the just claims of the minority in Manitoba. And I have no doubt that the indulgence and leniency shown to me by this House on previous occasions will ever be extended to me when ever I rise to fulfil my duties in that respect. I more particularly crave your forbearance on the present occasion, as I have to deal

with matters clad with some unpleasantness. The nature of the observations I have to offer is indicated by my motion. Judging from the public utterances of some of the members of the Manitoba Government, I am led to believe that some representations, or rather misrepresentations, may have been made to this Government, in view of their possible action, on the working of the school system in existence in Manitoba prior to 1890. Otherwise, it would surely strike the mind of everybody that it is, to say the least, a very questionable way of dealing with so serious a subject to go before the public, and now, without any warning to the parties interested, or to the government here, raise objections unheard of before, objections which were not raised at the beginning of this turmoil, nor have been since during the five years of contention just elapsed. That sudden change of front, this volley of accusations, so tardy and new, must at once excite distrust in the accusations and in the accusers themselves. If their intention, when contemplating changes in the educational system, was simply to create an evil and foster the educational interest of the people (I mean the whole people, not one section only), why did they not begin by making a proper investi-

gation of the whole subject? Why did they not call upon the interested parties then? Why did they not advise the Roman Catholics that they had good reason to believe that there was something wrong in the management of their schools? Why did they not urge upon the minority the necessity of improving their system, and why did they not, after mature consideration and loyal negotiation with the representatives of the Catholic section bring down some measure as framed as to meet the requirements of the case, while respecting the constitution, the vested rights of the minority and the honest and conscientious feelings of the pioneers of education in that country? For, as I will show you hereafter, we were the first to open schools in the North-west. If they had acted in that way they would have shown their sincerity, they would have found men and a whole population most willing to discuss with them the educational interests of the province and to accede to any reasonable suggestions, and thereby save the Dominion from an agitation antagonistic to peace, union and the consolidation of our political fabric. But without any warning except in the public press, without visiting our schools (which they had the power of doing, as I will show you hereafter) without approaching the representatives men of the Catholic population, with the view of considering the best way of curing the alleged evils, without suggesting any mode, regulations or legislation in harmony with the principles laid down by the province at its creation and for twenty years afterwards in the matter of education, they proceeded, seemingly, to replace the old system by a new one, but in reality to wipe out the Catholic schools, and revive, under the name of public schools, the Protestant schools, just as they were before. We were given no alternative, to improve our schools or to lose them. It is the destruction of our schools they wanted; that is the only thing that was signified to us under the form of bills which, with some immaterial amendments, came into force on the first day of May, 1890, and which accomplished the purpose that the Manitoba Government had in view, viz., the exclusion of the Catholics from participating in the financial advantages offered to others by the province in educational matters unless they would consent to conditions which were known beforehand of impossible acceptance. Let me quote the utterance of

a gentleman highly respected here, Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald:

There can be no doubt, he has repeatedly said, that the law was brought into force in the most brutal manner, and for purely political purposes. The men who kept themselves in power by their appeals in favour of national schools, cared very little about the matter, yet they knew by raising such a cry they would draw the public mind away from the short comings of the government and its general policy.

Mr. Macdonald is not alone in his appreciation of the unfair way we have been treated. A provincial newspaper, the *Mountain Monitor*, published in 1892 the following lines:

This measure was carried through by brutal force, without regard to the feeling or sentiment of the minority. No compensation, no conciliation, no compromise was at all attempted. The country never asked for such legislation. It was a measure of revenge.. instead of a measure based on impartiality and justice to all. Mr. Gladstone, in his Irish church disestablishment bill laid down the splendid principle that no interest should be effected without fair compensation, and no living person should be disturbed in the exercise of his right and privilege or position. That's statesmanship; that measure contained no such fairness. All that is held dear to a large number of our fellow country men must be swept away. The ruthless way this act was carried through the Manitoba House would disgrace the actions of the uncivilized savages of the South Sea Islanders, or of a buccaneering crew on the high seas.

This paper is published by a Protestant and is very much opposed to the Catholic church, as you may judge by the way it speaks of the Catholic clergy in the same article from which I have taken the above quotation: "The ruthless", it says, "and tyrannical methods of the Quebec hierarchy have been copied and introduced in Manitoba by the Protestants". This shows that there is no partiality in our favour on the part of that newspaper, and it gives great force to its views. Does not that retrospective view of what took place in 1890, tell the story of to-day? Is not the unfairness of that time suggestive of the probable unfairness of to-day? Can we not assume at once that deeds and legislation born in injustice and brutality are sought to be maintained by abuse and slander? What reliance is to be attached to the utterances of public men who, for the sake of party advantages, pledged their party and their government to the maintenance of institutions which they knew—which had been in operation under their eyes for many and many years, and who, afterwards, for party advantages

also broke their pledges, and sullied the honour and the dignity of this province? It is not out of place to recall the fact that the government of Manitoba has been convinced, by incontrovertible evidence, from the ranks of their own party as well as from our ranks, of having, through Mr. Greenway, undertaken to maintain our schools, our language and our electoral divisions as they were at the time he was called to form a government. That was the time for announcing their policy and of indicating to the people the reforms they had in contemplation; that was the time for pointing out the evils of our schools, if any there were; but no, then they were satisfied with the existing condition of things, so much so that they did not hesitate to pledge themselves to its maintenance. Two years had not elapsed, however, when, false to their promises and to their own word, they faced about and threw the country into a state of discontent and almost endless agitation, by wiping out, without any attempt at compromise, the very things which they were bound, in honour and in good policy to uphold. Again, I ask, what credibility can be attached to the utterances of such false public men. None whatever. It seems to me we should have been exempt from going through the ordeal of defending institutions which they had committed themselves to maintain and which they could control. The malicious aspersions to which we have been lately subjected from these gentlemen have evidently no other foundation than the necessity in which they now find themselves to raise false and side issues, in order to make good before a certain public the hopeless position which the decision of the Privy Council has placed them in. They believe by exciting passions and prejudices that they may succeed for some time longer in defeating the ends of justice. Let us hope that the good sense of the people will carry our country safely through this new whirlwind, and that the two sisters known by the names of peace and justice, will conquer the hearts of all the provinces, and draw to them the best part of the nation. The question that is now before the public is not a question of expediency; it is a question of right. It is not a question of regulations; it is a question of principles. Are the Catholics entitled to their schools? that is the question. How to regulate them comes next. The schools might have been the contrary of what the minority

claim they were; they might have been a thousand times worse than what they are represented to have been by our opponents; that would not destroy the constitutional and equitable right of the Catholics to their existence, and to have the same restored. The management of the schools is quite a different thing from their constitutionality, or from the vested right of the Catholics to have them. Let the Catholics have their schools, and let the management of the same be properly attended to afterwards. If the government of Manitoba in 1890 had the evidence and the conviction, which they contend now they had, that our schools were in a state of inefficiency, or otherwise improperly managed, they simply have been twice derelict to their duties—first, in not taking the proper means of putting them on a better footing, and second, in encroaching upon the rights and privileges of the minority. For, let us not be deceived by what they say; they had full power and opportunity of exercising control over our schools, as I will show hereafter. Since they had that power and that duty, since they have not thought proper to avail themselves of such power and to fulfil their duty, they cannot base an argument now on their own fault and ask for an investigation the results of which, whether good or bad, cannot have any bearing on the merit of the case as it stands to-day. This idea of having an investigation now is only an afterthought, a new device to postpone the settlement of this important matter. We have been suffering for too many years now to afford to be put off again by such a procrastinating process as has been suggested. It was thought by this Parliament five years ago that it might be better to refer the matter to the judicial tribunals. It has been so referred. The highest court of the empire has adjudged in our favour. This government has very properly taken action on that judgment. So far the Catholics are satisfied, but they are now looking to the carrying out of the government's policy as announced by the Prime Minister on the floor of this House at the beginning of this session, and I hasten to add that they are confident that that policy will be carried out without any undue delay.

I repeat that the re-establishment of our schools must take place as a matter of right. It cannot depend on the state of efficiency or inefficiency in which they might have been

prior to 1890 ; it cannot depend on any facts, disclosures, statements or evidence that might be adduced one way or another. We have an inherent right to them outside of any extraneous circumstances. That is the construction put upon the constitution by the Privy Council. Hence, the uselessness of such an investigation. Moreover, that would not cure past evils, if there were any. As to the future, it can be taken care of without the expense to the country, the hardships to the minority, and the trouble to the whole Dominion, that the appointment of any commission now would entail.

But, for all that, hon. gentlemen, the Catholics of Manitoba are not averse to speaking of their schools, which were the equal in every respect to the schools of the other section, and in some respects superior. They were superior inasmuch as the two languages, French and English, were taught in them, while the English language only was taught in the schools of the Protestant section. They were immensely superior again in as much as positive and definite christianity was taught in them and a higher course of religious training given, while in the others, they were satisfied with very little in that direction. I propose now to take notice of the charges that have been directed against our schools and deal fully with such slanderous accusations. As I said at the outset, the fact that these accusations are launched by the very men who have been convicted of having been false to the electors, false to their own word, and false to their own pledges, who are under the ban of a verdict from the highest court of the Empire, charging them with injustice towards a section of their own countrymen, which is much more serious than if they had been simply declared erroneous interpreters of the constitution ; who did not attempt to prune the tree that displeased them, but simply cut it down and set it on fire—that fact, I say, should lead everybody to hesitate before crediting those denunciations. But there are good people who are apt to be led astray by these charges constantly repeated, and it is but right that there should be given some explanation and contradiction. The first evidence that I will cite is an extract from the speeches of Mr. Martin, the author of the law. It will at once throw light on the subject. He was the strongest advocate of the measure and had no consider-

ation for our views or our feelings. But he took his position on public grounds, fearlessly and boldly, and I have yet to learn that he descended to the abuse to which we are subjected to-day. When introducing his measure in the local House, he said :

The government's action had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department are conducted under this system, but because they are dissatisfied with the system itself.

So dissatisfaction as to the management of the schools was not the cause of the Manitoba Government's action. Mr. Martin was dissatisfied with the system itself, as not agreeing with his views as to what should be a system of national schools. That is all. We may differ from him as to that. I do strongly differ from him in that respect, both as to the matter of policy and, in our peculiar case, as to the constitutional power of the legislature to pass that measure. But that is a stand which rests on public grounds and which can, on that account, be honestly defended without descending to abuse or slander. This declaration of Mr. Martin is clear evidence that the Government of Manitoba was bound then to have the system changed. It was not a question of efficiency or inefficiency. They wanted the change under any circumstances. They needed no investigation and they did not make any. Without going into any inquiry as to the internal efficiency or inefficiency of the system they made the change, and from that we are justified to-day in saying that the new stand now taken by that government is nothing but a subterfuge. And right here may I be allowed, hon. gentlemen, to place before your eyes practical evidence of the efficiency of our schools ? I have placed on the table specimens of work from different schools which everybody may look at, and I am confident that no one will find any fault with them. Some are admirable specimens. All these are the work of the pupils. The maps are done from memory. Of course these come from our best schools, but the teachers in these schools are also the teachers in a great many other schools. In fact these teachers are twenty-five per cent of the whole staff, and fifty per cent of the other teachers are their pupils, and had a normal school training in these institutions from which these specimens are taken. Such pupils having had the advantage of such teachers must surely have some ability of their own

also, and be considered as fit for the position of teacher in the rural part of the country. I will now proceed to the consideration of the accusations laid against us. For the sake of convenience I will take the indictment as brought by the Attorney General of Manitoba. It will be found in the *Globe* of the 25th April, 1895:

THE OLD SYSTEM.

Mr. Sifton then explained the state of things prior to 1890. There were, he said, what might be called two systems of public schools in existence, a Protestant system and a Catholic system, with a Board of Education having a Catholic section and a Protestant section. The Board of Education absolutely controlled the system, the Catholic section their schools and the Protestant section the Protestant schools. Each section received its grant, and the Government was not seen at all in the system. This state of things lasted from 1871 to 1890, and the people, therefore, had had ample time to see how it worked out. The way that it did work out was that the teachers placed in charge of the schools were not fit to teach anywhere. The examination papers on which they got their certificates were such as would be set for boys of nine years of age. Then the attendance at school was not looked after at all. The schools were not opened regularly, and there was no inspection. The money grants were paid all the same, although schools might not have been opened more than three or four days a week, or for only two or three months in the year. Another objectionable thing about the old system of Catholic schools was that the accommodation was simply abominable except in the case of about twelve or fifteen out of the whole number. Although this was the case, these Catholic schools were getting about twice as much under the Government grant as the Protestant schools were. The result of all this was that under this system one generation of French Catholics grew up almost absolutely illiterate. Mr. Sifton here referred to petitions sent to the Government, in which six out of seven of the petitioners were unable to sign their names and had to make their marks. Since he had come to Ontario on this present visit he had received an urgent petition sent to the Government, and signed by 27 French half-breeds. Of these 24 made their marks, and only three signed their names. This was not a pleasant thing to tell, but it was true, and was the result of the old system, which it was the desire of the Government to restore. One could go from one end of Manitoba to the other, and he would not find among the business or professional men a young man from any of those families. The children of such families remained on the farm where they were born. There was no idea of progress among them. If this system were imposed upon them permanently it would simply make them hewers of wood and drawers of water.

This is indeed a very severe and pretty extensive indictment. The misfortune about it is that it is groundless, abusive and unworthy of a man occupying in his province

the position of an adviser of the Crown, and of a sworn guardian of the honour and of the interests of all sections of the province and of the whole population without distinction of creed or race. The statements of Mr. Sifton are not only misleading, but untrue, slanderous and ungenerous. In a very brief manner I will dispose of them. Before, however, considering them *seriatim*, I want to make this House aware of an important fact. It is this: Never before the Manitoba Government had announced their policy on this matter in 1889, never was any remark made to us about the alleged inefficiency of our schools. Never was a suggestion thrown out to us; never was blame cast upon us; never was a hint given us as to any drawback that was supposed to exist or as to any improvement that could have been desired. We were not averse to any fair criticism, if any had to be made. If any desire had been expressed to us as to some advisable reform, we would have received the intimation in the most cordial way, and given it the most serious consideration. But far from that, our schools had been generally praised. Very often people after visiting our settlements and our institutions, came to us, and expressed their surprise—they could not refrain from letting us perceive that our ways, our thrifty and prosperous condition, the excellence of our educational appliances were a revelation to them. So much so that Protestant families were prompted by that excellence, and by the care that the children received in certain institutions, to have their children educated in those institutions. On this point I can give such testimony as that of Captain Clark, which I again ask permission to lay before this House, although it has already been read to you:

I can speak with experience with reference to the excellence of your section, two of my daughters having been for a long time with the good sisters of St. Boniface, where their progress was as satisfactory to me as it was pleasant to them.

I take the following extract from the *Canadian Gazette* of London, published on the 4th November, 1886, and speaking of our school exhibits at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition:

The collection contains samples of books, exercises, scholastic material, &c., coming from the Catholic schools as well as from the Protestant schools of the province.

The excellence of the work, and especially of the geographical charts, is incontestable. This is the more pleasing, if we consider the fact that many

exhibits are dated from the year 1884, and the beginning of the year 1885. It is evident the exhibit is composed of the ordinary duties of the schools in all parts of the province, and not of work specially prepared for the occasion.

No pretension has been made to eclipse the school exhibits of the other provinces, but the collection that is under our eyes denotes that in one of the most recently organized provinces of the confederation, there exists a school system which, although respecting the faith and religious convictions of the population, offers to every one an education capable of fitting for the highest rank in society, the child who is placed under its care.

So, hon. gentlemen, up to the time of the extraordinary change of mind of these gentlemen of the Manitoba Government, instead of being remonstrated with, we had on all occasions been praised, especially for the excellence of our educational institutions. On several occasions, men in the highest position in the land, Governors General and Lieutenant-Governors, and other distinguished visitors, paid to our educational institutions the highest compliment. One day, one of the trustees of the Protestant schools in Winnipeg was invited to visit one of our schools in that city. He had only words of praise to address to the pupils and teachers. How could we suspect then that our schools might afterwards be arraigned in such a general and violent way? But let us admit for a moment that there were some deficiencies in our schools, in the teaching or in the management, what was the duty of the government? Was it necessary to demolish the whole structure to remedy the defects? Most assuredly not. All the subjects of complaint could have been cured in some other way. If we were not considered sufficiently in touch with the government, it was an easy matter to make such amendments to the law as would have been equally satisfactory to both parties. It was an easy matter to approach the general board of education and to intimate to any section that reforms and improvements were desired. And if amendments to the law were necessary, it was an easy matter to have framed them so as to respect the feelings and the rights of all sections of the people. If there was any mismanagement the fault was due to some individuals. Why not remove those individuals and put in better men instead of punishing the whole Catholic population? Such amendments might have been resorted to as a trial at least. It would have gone a long way toward convincing our people that no harm or injustice was intended; but, far

from that, all of a sudden, without any warning, we were put face to face with the present difficulties, our schools were annihilated, our properties confiscated, and the schools that were known before as Protestant schools, were continued, in the same shape and form, under substantially the same regulations, under the name of public schools. The absence of regard for our feelings and for our rights is the clearest evidence that some other motives than the improvement of the schools were at the bottom of that campaign. As a matter of fact, Mr. Fisher, the then president of the Liberal Association in Manitoba, informed the country what those motives were. They were for party advantages, and, after having adopted such a policy for party advantages, they persist in it for the same purpose; but as there is some need to disguise that purpose, they resort to slander and abuse in the hope of raising the strongest prejudices to blind the people as to the real issue now confronting the country. Let us look more carefully into Mr. Sifton's statements. He begins by describing the school system in Manitoba and is pleased to inform his audience that we had two systems of schools. This first statement is, to say the least, inaccurate. I have already shown that we had only one system of schools. That was a system of public schools, which were more national than those by which they have been replaced. That system provided for the needs of all sections of the people, and not for a part only. The law itself (statutes 1881) says that it was to establish a system of public schools. There was only one law, applying to all the schools, and it gave, as it should, the control of the schools to the parents, according to their religious convictions. It was so framed and carried out that the term of "separate schools" which is applied to the Catholic schools very often is quite inappropriate. Our Catholic schools were no more separate schools than were the Protestant schools. Each one had towards the other the same status. The Protestant schools were as much separate schools as the Catholic schools. There was no inferiority in the one as to the other; they were on an equal footing. You can go all through that law and you will find its provisions applicable to all the schools. One of our strongest opponents, Rev. Dr. Bryce, has himself confessed the fairness of the system in the following terms in 1877. The

government grant is voted for one system of schools. * * No special rights are given to either Catholics or Protestants. In Manitoba the Roman Catholic schools are as much national as the Protestants.

Mr. Sifton complains that the action of the government was not seen at all in the system. This again is inaccurate. The hand of the government was directly felt in matters of money. As a matter of fact the government had the controlling power in financial matters. The law itself provided for the payment to the schools of the government grant. That grant was retained by the government, whose treasurer was the guardian of the school funds. The government themselves had the power to fix the appropriations of the sections of the Board of Education, and no payment was made except through the government and after having been submitted to the control of the provincial auditor, and received his watchful consideration and approval. So in financial matters not only the control of government was seen, but they had their hands completely upon the funds, their distribution and their payment. They were all powerful as to the whole expenditure of the two sections, and they exercised their power, and sometimes they did it in a very high-handed way. In 1889, for instance, were had a reserve fund amounting to nearly \$14,000. The government of Manitoba although not authorized by law to do so, demanded our board to had over to them that reserve fund. In that demand, however, they fully acknowledged that fund to be ours, and gave us assurance that it would be available to our section at any time.

After having thus given us the assurance that the money would always be available to us, they went back on their own decision, and deprived us of that amount, they refused to distribute that money to our schools, although we had regularly applied for the same, and put before them a regular requisition and apportionment. That is another instance of the utter disregard with which we have been treated. As I have already said, this campaign commenced in 1888, at the St. Francois Xavier election, by false promises. It has been ever since followed by treason and hardships, which it is hardly possible to describe. Untrue to their pledges from the first, they have been untrue to their own policy as laid down by Mr. Greenway when he went to the late Archbishop Taché, with

the view of receiving from His Grace help in the forming of his government, help which, on his pledge, was so willingly given to him only to bring afterwards to the lamented prelate such bitter disappointment that it may be said to have hastened his death.

The government had in another way its hand on the Bureau of Education, inasmuch as they had the appointment of the members of the board. Each year the term of three members of our section expired. On the government devolved the privilege and the power of appointing successors to the retiring members. In this particular also they used their power in their own way, and for their own advantage, in appointing at one time other parties than those recommended by the Catholics, and at another time in neglecting to make appointments. The appointment of the superintendent was also the privilege of the government. More than that, during the whole time, from the accession to power of the Liberal government in Manitoba till the coming into force of the law of 1890, the government was represented on our Catholic section of the Education Board by one of their members, and for the last six months at least there was also a member of the government on the Protestant section of the Board of Education. So the government had two of their members closely connected with the administration of the school law under the old system.

The members of the government and of the legislature were, by law, visitors of the schools. A book was there, in which they could record their comments. Why did not avail themselves of it? From all this, it will clearly appear to everybody that the government had a closer connection with the administration of educational affairs than one would be led to believe by the utterances of Mr. Sifton, and, consequently, that gentleman must be held to have disgracefully attempted to mislead public opinion, unless we come to the conclusion that he has no knowledge of the old law, which would be no surprise to me. On that point, I think I may safely say that at least four-fifths of the members of the legislature which passed that law of 1890 were not adequately acquainted with the old law. That ignorance of the old law was perceptible in the bill that was prepared. For instance, it designated as separate schools, the schools attended and controlled

by the Catholics, and public schools those controlled by the Protestants. The fact was that both were simply common schools. That is the appellation which the law of 1881 gave them.

Mr. Sifton says that the system was in force from 1871 to 1890, and therefore the people had had ample time to see how it worked out. Although in discussing this question I am bound to reserve the constitutional question, I am quite prepared also to consider what was the opinion of the people at the end of that period, since there is an appeal made to that opinion on the other side. Is it necessary for me to recall to you that in 1888 an election took place in one of the constituencies of Manitoba, in which election the fate of the administration and of the opposition respectively was at stake? What took place, then? That question first came up in that election incidentally and soon became the turning point. Mr. Fisher, then the president of Liberal association, said in 1893:

This became practically the leading question of the campaign and the contest was a crucial one. Should the Liberals win, it was plain, in the view of the losses sustained by the government, that they must resign. So the success of the Liberal candidates means that the party would at once attain power, while the election of Mr. Burke would almost certainly have insured the continuance of the Liberals in opposition till this day.

It is as clear as daylight, then, that the question came before the people at that election. Let us see how it was dealt with. The Conservatives, by their candidate, wanted to maintain the school system then in existence. Did the Liberals take the opposite view? Not at all. Feeling that the people wanted to maintain that system, they declared the policy of their party in this matter, otherwise the election would have gone against them, and would, to use the words of Mr. Fisher, "insure the continuance of the Liberals in opposition to this day." They then declared—and here I again use the words of Mr. Fisher—that "the Liberals had no idea of interfering with those institutions;" and Mr. Martin gave a positive pledge, in the name of the Liberal party, that they would not do so. Mr. Greenway was a party to the giving of that promise. The pledge was given in the name of the Liberal party, for a party purpose. Without that promise, the party could not have carried the election, and by that election alone they attained power. Now, hon. gen-

tlemen, you have here the two political parties making an appeal to the people at a crucial time on that very question; the Conservatives pointing to their past record in favour of the maintenance of that school system; the Liberals desiring to attain power and for that purpose declaring that their future policy would be to maintain in their integrity the same institutions. These declarations were made by the leaders on behalf of their respective parties. They were the declarations, not only of the leaders, but of their followers also. That is, you have in this instance the electors requiring both parties to pledge themselves to the maintenance of the school system which had existed for twenty years. "The people," to use the words of Mr. Sifton, "had had ample time to see how it worked out," and the same people, far from being dissatisfied with the system, felt on the contrary so strongly in favour of its maintenance that both parties (that is the whole of the electors) had to pledge themselves to that effect. That was the verdict of the people at that time. Afterwards Mr. Greenway, when forming his government, went to Archbishop Taché and again pledged his party to the maintenance of that school system, as is proved by the declarations of Rev. Father Allard and of Mr. Alloway, himself a Liberal. After that Mr. Greenway had a general election in the province. The platform of his party, as declared in the previous election between Mr. Burke and Mr. Francis, was public and fresh to the memory of the whole province, and still standing. Did the people then declare themselves against it? Not at all. Nothing was said against that policy. Mr. Greenway, pledged as he was with his party to maintain that school system, was returned to power with the largest majority that ever existed in Manitoba in favour of any government. That verdict is evidence that the people who had had ample time, and good opportunities to judge of the working of that system, were satisfied with it. We have other expressions of the satisfaction of the people with that system in the following fact: In 1888, the same year that Mr. Greenway came to power, the superintendent of the Protestant schools, Mr. Somerset, expresses himself in this way at a meeting of teacher:—

In connection with its working (the law) during the last seventeen years it may be pointed out that the schools of the province have been managed without a particle of the denominational friction

that has caused disturbance and bitterness in other provinces of the Dominion ** the past history of the province encourages the hope that perfect justice to each interest shall result in a continuance of the harmony that now exists.

These words surely do not indicate any desire for a change in the system, although some of the details of the law might require change to suit the circumstances. Another gentleman, Mr. Morrisson, who is himself a Protestant, an Orangeman, and was for a time an inspector of Protestant schools in our province, published last year a paper in which he says :

Throughout all those years, from 1871 to 1888, no complaint was ever made with the workings of the separate schools system. * * * The people, Protestant and Catholic alike, were perfectly contented with the school system as it then existed.

And here, let me recall to you this statement of the *Morden Monitor* which I have already quoted : "The country never asked for such legislation."

But, honourable gentlemen, above all, the best evidence of the satisfaction of the people of Manitoba in connection with the late school system was the entire absence of complaints about it. They "had had ample time to see how it worked out," and they did not complain, showing thereby that they were satisfied to maintain it. The query must very naturally arise in the minds of the honourable members of this House : How, then, did the legislature come to pass the law of 1890? In answer to that I would say that the question was suddenly thrown upon the attention of the public by a couple of public men without any authorization on the part of their leader. Mr. Greenway, who, hearing for the first time of the new platform that two members of his government were advocating, was reported as saying : "It's all bosh." It was contended at the time by a leading newspaper that again this move was inaugurated for party purposes, and the accusation has not been, up to the present, successfully repelled. However, in 1890, the government, which had attained power on the pledge that they would not interfere with the language or institutions of the French Catholic population, introduced in the legislature two bills, by which they proposed to interfere with those institutions, and the legislature, which itself had been elected upon that platform of non-interference, disregarded the mandate it had received from the people and passed those iniquitous

laws, with the view in all likelihood to serve party purposes again. And now, I am quite ready to admit that if the question was squarely and solely put before the people at present there is a probability that it would be decided against us, because the passions and the prejudices of the people have been raised, and between the judgment of the people in 1888 declaring itself for the maintenance of the school system then in force, and the contradictory judgment of the same people to-day, I would say that the first was a calm, deliberate, cool and unprejudiced judgment, while the second would not be, and, consequently, the parliament of Canada must in all fairness and equity give their preference to the former, and declare that the people "having had ample time to see how the system worked out," and being satisfied with that system, it was an extreme injustice to interfere with established institutions, an injustice to the Catholic population and an injustice to the country at large, inasmuch as the peace of the whole country has been disturbed by such action. As a conclusion of my argument on this point, I am safe to say that there is no foundation for the assertion that the people of Manitoba have ever asked for a change; I may even say that there was practically, in 1888, at the date of the last general election previous to 1890, a unanimous consent that the existing institutions should be maintained, and the legislature, in passing the laws of 1890 went directly against the mandate it had received from the people. A grave accusation against our people is made by Mr. Sifton in the following words :—

One could go from one end of Manitoba to the other and he would not find, among business or professional men, a young man from any of these families : the *children of such families remained on the farm where they were born*.

Although unwillingly given and not intended as so, it is the most eloquent test to our school system. If the hon. gentleman had first put himself to the trouble of making the inquiry he was inviting his audience to make, he would have found that he was misleading them. Right in Winnipeg and throughout the Catholic sett'ements there are young men who are engaged in business, some in professional studies. They cannot be as numerous as the young men of other nationalities, for the simple reason that the group of population to which they belong is

a small minority. The fact of a great majority of the population being of a different creed, and having a different language, reduces to a great extent, for our children, the natural field which others have for the display of their ability; and, consequently, it hinders them and reduces their desire to engage in professional and mercantile pursuits. But apart from this there is another reason which Mr. Sifton has given himself, and although that gentleman has done so very unwittingly, that reason is one of the best compliments that could be paid to our young generation and our school system. "The children of such families," said he, "remain on the farm where they were born." True most of our children remain on the farm. If that is the result of our school system, by all means, for the welfare of the country, let us preserve that system. What is, in our days, one of the evils complained of and confronting the normal advance of the social movement? Is it not the migration of the rural population to towns and cities? Is it not the inordinate and disproportionate increase in the number of business and professional men? Not more than two or three weeks ago our distinguished colleague, the member for Hopewell, speaking in this House, said that "many of those who go into business should remain on the farm." And this honest and wholesome truth is in harmony with the views of all thinking people. The Ottawa *Citizen* of the 2nd of May last contained the following editorial on the subject:—

TOO MANY PROFESSIONAL MEN.

In England the cry is "Back to the land." There, as elsewhere, farmers have been leaving the soil to plunge into the whirl of city life. The glitter and movement, the roar and noise, of large centres attract the countryman, who begins to find his existence on the farm monotonous, and who sees possible prizes for which he thinks he may strive with good chances of success.

Back to the farm, even in this new country, we might well desire our people to go. All kinds of business feel the stress of sharp competition. All the professions are overcrowded. The *Canadian Medical Review* states that in Toronto there are scores of medical men not making \$2 a day,—a very poor return indeed for the long years spent upon their education and for the amount of money devoted to it,—a very unsatisfactory sum on which to keep up the style of living that a professional man aspires to. The *Barrister*, a legal publication, deals with the same subject in its April number. It says: "It is probable that the incomes of ninety per cent of the profession do not average \$600 a year, while fifteen years ago the average was about \$1,000 a year." In other words, hundreds of soli-

citors throughout the country are working for less than brick-layers and carpenters. Young men on the farm would do well to bear these facts in mind when their ambition is aroused by reading stories of the brilliant successes of Lord Erskine, Lord Eldon and other great men who began with nothing but achieved high distinction and won rich rewards. Necessarily the number of the Erskines and Eldons is limited.

If we take into consideration the circumstances of our own province, we could not too strongly emphasize not only the opportunity, but even the necessity for our own sons to remain upon the farms—the necessity not only for their own sake, but also for the sake of the country. East and west, north and south of Winnipeg we have immense prairies, amongst the most fertile land in the world. Our province is above all and almost exclusively an agricultural country. Would it be an intelligent, patriotic and well-conceived policy to induce our young people to leave their farms and go into the cities and towns, where every year there is an influx of half-educated or lazy people constantly swelling that unfortunate portion of the population, whose lot it is to be a burden on the community, whilst if they had remained on their farms they could very likely have been counted amongst the most useful citizens of the land? This does not mean that the farmer should not be educated, but the fact that he is a farmer is no evidence of his being uneducated. And even if he was, I contend that an illiterate but honest, hard-working and fair-minded tiller of the soil is a better citizen than the philosopher whose instruction only serves him to better blaspheme his God. The illiterate farmer is a better citizen than Ingersoll with all his so-called science; the illiterate farmer who lives and lets others live in peace and justice is a better citizen than Mr. Greenway or Mr. Sifton, who go through the country disseminating false information, slandering a loyal and intelligent people, and doing their utmost to excite a section of the community against the other for the purpose of maintaining, against the wish of Her Majesty, the injustice of which they have been convicted by the highest tribunal of the empire.

The country is simply distressed by these politicians, whilst its prosperity and the development of its natural resources are promoted by the quiet, thrifty, righteous, industrious and intelligent, though perhaps underrated husbandman. "I wish" said

Mr. Gladstone, one day in 1889, "to dispel any notions that may be entertained that manual industry is necessarily an ignoble thing. Rely upon it, manual labour is honourable, not only because it is useful, but honourable beyond the measure of its direct utility, when directed to honourable aims and honourable purposes." Fancy now the young Mr. Sifton opposing his dictum to the opinion of the Grand Old Man, and discrediting manual labour in the persons of the farmers and of those of their sons who choose to remain on the farms where they were born. These young men were given education before 1890, and we continue to give them the best education we can provide, notwithstanding the hardships to which we are now being subjected. We believe in education. There is, however, something which is above education, and that is proper education. When Mr. Sifton is discrediting that kind of education to which he attributes the fact of so many young men remaining on the farms, he shows that he has no sound idea of what a good education should be, or of the results that such education should produce. He is advocating that kind of education which, according to the chief of the detective force in San Francisco, "makes the pick, shovel and wheebarrow repugnant to American youth." Speaking about the same kind of education, Prof. Royce, in his book, "Deterioration and Race Education," says that "the public schools system in the United States (which is the pattern of the system that is tried to be established in our community) kills in the child all inclination for physical work; it fills the country with office seekers," &c.

With the kind permission of the House I will read a picture which a gentleman writing in a United States newspaper, draws of the kind of education obtained in the public schools of that country:

Neither the boys, he says, nor the girls taught (I won't say educated) in the public schools want actual work for a living. Very few of the boys are willing to learn trades, especially if they are kept at school long enough to get notions about being "gentlemen." Nearly all expect to get into some light occupation, something "respectable" and not requiring them to soil their hands or wear workshop clothing. They are willing to be book-keepers or salesmen, or general "clerks," or to be taken into banks, and many of them have an eye on broker's offices in Wall streets, and many more on the offices the politicians are fighting for. But they don't want to turn to and learn to be carpenters or blacksmiths, or plumbers, or bricklayers, or

stonecutters, or anything else that seems a steady day's work with the hands. This is why New York is swarming to-day with fairly taught young men looking for situations as clerks or bookkeepers or as conductors on the street cars, or as canvassers of all sorts, and unable to get them. These thousands were produced largely by a false education, twenty or thirty years ago, and we are producing other thousands, many more thousands to-day to replace them when they go.

In conclusion this writer says:

The fancy schools of to-day are in some respect a positive evil. Instead of "fitting our youth to earn a living," they unfit them to a large extent and tend to make them idlers instead of workers.

The same complaint is becoming general all over the world, and in Canada also expression has been given to the same ideas. However, Mr. Sifton wants it to be forced upon the people, and he makes a crime of the unwillingness of a section of the country to adopt his views. He finds fault with a system of education which instead of producing a distaste for rural life tends to keep our sons on the farms; he would prefer a system of education which might tend to take the young men away from the farms and make of them such office-seekers as I have just mentioned, a system that would swell the already overcrowded ranks of professional men in our cities and towns, whilst around all these cities and towns there are splendid farms unoccupied and unproductive to the great disadvantage of the province and of the country at large. I repeat, instead of demonstrating the inferiority of our teaching, the fact that our youth remain on the farms is strong evidence of its soundness both in its conception and in its results.

Mr. Sifton, speaking of the attendance at our schools, said:

The attendance at school was not looked after at all.

From this remark one would think that our schools were deserted. The figures that I will place before you will be a surprise to you, as are many other assertions of our enemies. However, before giving these figures I should like to call your attention to a social aspect of the population of the North-west. This kind of preface is important inasmuch as it warns the public at once that matters in the far west should not be looked at in the same way as one would regard them in the east. Everybody knows that there is, in the province of Manitoba, a section of the population whose origin has much influence upon its views, customs

methods and whole behaviour. I am alluding to the half-breeds. These half-breeds are possessed of a noble character; they are brave and intelligent. But you must not forget that they were once almost the kings of the immense prairie. Then, they were isolated and the rest of the world had not much existence for them. They had no idea of the approaching change which took place in 1871, through the acquisition of the North-west by Canada. They were roaming through those solitudes without any apprehension of what was coming, and while proud of the white blood circulating in their veins, the blood from their mother made itself felt strongly. In their estimation, the freedom of their life, while fishing and hunting, was superior to our cares of our civilization. That was a time of liberty for them, and such was the force of the Indian blood quickening their pulse, and the influence of the prairie breeze fawning their brows that to convince them the time had come when they should put a stop to their free life and adopt our methods of life, was a task fraught with difficulties unknown to the larger portion of the present population of the far west. If you take into consideration the instincts of those people, their love of a wandering and unrestrained life, resulting from nature, from their origin, you will not wonder at the indifference at first of some amongst them to education. The Catholic church counts in its rank, by far the largest proportion of that element. Yet, notwithstanding that disadvantage, which necessarily puts us at a disadvantage in a comparison of statistics, I am sure that the Senate will find that after all we did not make too bad a showing. In going back to 1881, and comparing the percentage of the total school enrolment of both Protestant and Catholic children to the whole school population, we find the following:—

PERCENTAGE OF THE CHILDREN ENROLMENT TO THE TOTAL SCHOOL POPULATION.

1881.

Protestant schools.....	70 $\frac{2}{5}$
Catholic schools.....	66 $\frac{1}{5}$
1889.	
Protestant schools.....	75 $\frac{1}{5}$
Catholic schools.....	69 $\frac{6}{5}$

It is to be remarked that in the case of the Catholics, the percentage is obtained by taking the school population from the age of 5 to 16, while in the case of the Protes-

tants, it is obtained with a school population ranging from the age of 5 and under, up to 21, which must necessarily raise to a certain extent the percentage. But, taken as it is, there is only a difference of 6 per cent which is not sufficient to justify any criticism. Let us now take another point of comparison, that is, the

PERCENTAGE OF THE AVERAGE ATTENDANCE TO THE TOTAL SCHOOL POPULATION:—

1881.

Protestant schools.....	34 $\frac{3}{5}$
Catholic schools.....	32 $\frac{8}{5}$

1889.

Protestant schools.....	52 $\frac{4}{5}$
Catholic schools.....	46 $\frac{3}{5}$

Here again the difference is only from 2 to 6 per cent. There is nothing in that to have a storm raised. If we look at what has taken place under the new educational laws, inaugurated in 1890, what do we find? A continual decrease in the average attendance to the school population at the so-called public schools. The following figures are taken from the government reports:

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE TO THE SCHOOL POPULATION SINCE THE INAUGURATION OF THE NEW SYSTEM IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS:

1891.

Protestants	43 $\frac{3}{5}$
1892.	

Protestants	43 $\frac{3}{5}$
1893.	

Protestants.	41 $\frac{2}{5}$
1894.	

These figures show a continual decrease under the new system; and the percentage is less than it was in the Catholic schools as shown by the figures in the first place mentioned under this head. There is a third basis of comparison, and which is the true test of the interest taken by those in charge of the schools in the attendance. It is the percentage of the average attendance to the number of enrolled children and here the Catholics are ahead of the Protestants.

The percentage of the attendance to the whole school population is not the true test of the efficiency of the schools nor of their management. In all countries, there is a proportion of the school population which is not enrolled on the school attendance. That is to be found even in countries where compulsory education is the law. In Ontario for instance in 1891, according to the Statistical Year Book there were 78,512

children between 7 and 13 attending schools less than 100 days, although compulsory education is the law. It has always been so and it will ever be so in all countries, in defiance of all laws and of all exertions on the part of those in charge of the schools to ensure regular attendance. In those matters success is never equal to the will nor to the exertions. And the country which has come nearest to perfection in that respect is a Catholic country, the Luxemburg, in which the census has proved that out of a total school population of 31,580, the number of scholars actually attending elementary schools was 31,249, so that only 341 children were missing. That all the children do not attend school, can easily be explained by various circumstances, as for instance the distance, the severity of the climate, the condition of the roads, the pressure of work on the farms, the natural dislike of certain children to school work, the lack of interest sometimes in education on the part of the parents, all circumstances which are entirely out of the control of the school officials. It is not quite the same thing with the percentage of the attendance to the enrolment at schools. Here, although the rule should not be presented as an inflexible one, yet it is conceivable that the teachers and the officials can moderately influence the increase of that percentage, because they are more in contact with the children who are better situated to obey the impulse of their teachers. That influence we have made it felt as much as possible and the result shows our comparative success.

PERCENTAGE OF THE AVERAGE ATTENDANCE TO THE NUMBER OF ENROLLED CHILDREN.

Protestants.	Catholic.
1881..... 40.8.....	50.2
1889..... 65.7.....	66.1 ⁵
1891..... 56.7 ¹	Since the inaugu-
1892..... 55.7 ²	ration of the
1893..... 48.7 ³	new system.

The figures for the Catholic schools cannot be given, as they have been crippled in 1890 and deprived of the regular means to ascertain their condition. But the public schools, under the new regime, have kept in operation, and this table, based on the reports of the education department, is an evidence that they are keeping on decreasing under that so-called public school system, that system which is held before the public like these patent medicines as a cure to all disease.

But this does not tell the whole story. In considering their own reports more closely what do we find? Under the so-called public system, almost half of the whole school population did not attend school for more than half year, which means about five months only of school in the year. Here are the figures taken from their own report.

	Attendance less than 50 days.	Attendance 51-100 days.	Attendance less than 100 days.	Total school population.
1891...	6,656	7,340	13,996	28,678
1892...	6,075	6,231	12,306	29,594
1893...	7,539	8,414	15,953	34,417

Fancy those people, which such a record, cheeky enough to denounce their neighbours whom they do not know but whom they are bound to denounce any way.

As a matter of fact, while the Catholic school authorities exacted as a rule 200 days of attendance during the year, such were the difficulties that confronted the management of the Protestant section, that they requested the legislature to permit schools not kept over 6 months to receive their grants just the same. That was an amendment passed in 1885.

Moreover, for the last six years of its existence, our board with the view of stimulating attendance, had been awarding prizes for attendance in all the schools. This is an answer to those who affirm without any knowledge of what they say, that the attendance was not looked after. In Ontario the attendance was only $\frac{52}{100}$ in 1891, according to the Statistical Year-Book—less than in the Catholic schools in Manitoba. If I have referred to the other schools it is not to find fault. I am too well aware of the difficulties that have to be encountered in that new province; I am too fair-minded to bring any ill-founded accusation, but if those people are not to be blamed, why should we be censured while labouring in the same country under similar circumstances, having to meet the same difficulties, and showing as good results as others, and even better?

Those difficulties are well described in the report of some of the Protestant inspectors, as follows:—

Owing to the extreme youth of the scholars, it is thought best to close the schools during the winter season.

Another, and also perhaps to some extent, necessary evil, which militates against the standing of

our schools, is irregular attendance, the exigencies of haying and harvesting seasons, the inclemency of the winter weather, the sparse settlement, the sorid nature of some parents and their indifference to the intellectual welfare of their children, account largely for the fluctuating attendance. (Report of Rev. J. Pringle, 1886.)

Another one speaks in the following way:—

There are great drawbacks of regular attendance in country schools in this province, the state of the roads in wet weather, the severity of the winter, the long distances to be travelled, the requirements of home work so pressing in a new country, all these combine to make regular attendance at school extremely difficult. Consequently the teachers are at a disadvantage—due allowance must be made for this in judging of the results of their labours. (Rev. A. E. Cowley, 1886.)

The Protestant superintendent sums up these drawbacks, in the following, in his report:

Some allowance can be made for the irregularity of attendance * * * the distance from school being in many cases two or three miles, and the roads or trails few and imperfect.

Notwithstanding all the above reports some people continue to repeat their accusations against our schools, as if theirs could not in any way be the object of unfavourable comments. Our hope is in the sound judgment and good-will of Parliament.

Our opponents now turn their attention to our teachers, and I am sorry to say that the same slanderous way of dealing with them is resorted to. Fortunately for us, and unfortunately for the accusers, they have been so exaggerated in their denunciations that any man, on giving to them his earnest consideration, will detect the imposture that is attempted to be foisted upon the public. He who attempts to prove too much does not prove anything.

"The teachers," they say, "placed in charge of the schools were not fit to teach anywhere."

As you see, there is no exception; all the teachers, according to this assertion, were unfit for their positions.

And by whom is this broad accusation made? By parties who do not understand our language—the language of our schools—and who have never visited those schools. It is characteristic of those who assail Catholic education that they have never set their foot in any of our schools or institutions, and yet they take upon themselves to judge without knowing, not doubting for a moment that

they are doing a serious injustice to an important section of their fellow countrymen.

Was the intention of the gentleman who made that remark intending to assimilate the condition of our schools to that of the Protestant schools at a certain period? Very likely not. However, it may be interesting to quote here at the outset what the superintendent of the Protestant schools said in his report of 1887, about the insufficient qualifications of their teachers:

The operation of many of the rural schools during a portion only of the school year renders the task of keeping up a full supply of qualified teachers for the province a peculiar difficult one. Upon the closing of their schools for the winter, many teachers retire permanently from the work, and these schools with others opening for the first time the following spring produce a demand that severely strains the resources of the Board of Education to supply, and necessitates the issue of temporary licenses to a number of persons who are not fully qualified by training or literary attainment for teaching.

If that broad assertion is true, namely, that our teachers are not fit to teach anywhere, then, hon. gentlemen, the Protestant population of Winnipeg must be very derelict in their duties towards their children—for, just at this present moment, when I am addressing you, in one of the Catholic schools in that city, out of an aggregate attendance of above 200 pupils forty-five of them are Protestant children. So, at a time when, on account of the hardships that have been undergoing for five years, that institution must be presumed not to have the same means at its disposal to maintain its high standard, yet we find Protestant parents and children sufficiently confident as to the ability of the teachers and as to the general equipment of the institution, as to send their children to be educated there, and in such numbers as to form nearly one-fourth of the total numbers of pupils. Surely this public sympathy and confidence must show at once to every fair-minded man that the assertion to which I refer is in itself morally and substantially an impossibility, and consequently, a gross injustice to a body of teachers, to the efficiency of whom others also have borne testimony. I have already quoted the evidence of Capt. Clarke. Allow me again to refer to it. So long as the same accusations are proposed, so long must we defend ourselves with the arms which are at our command. Captain Clarke is a Protestant and was chosen by the govern-

ment of Canada to be one of the assistants of the High Commissioner in London at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. His high character and his own education give to his testimony which I have already quoted, peculiar importance. Can it be said with any semblance of truth that teachers who are the object of such commendation are unfit for their situation? If the teachers were not fit for their position, could they have formed pupils of sufficient ability to send such exhibits as those to which the Canadian *Gazette* alluded in such complimentary terms in the quotation I have already made? Mere honest common sense directs the answer!

About 25 per cent of the teaching staff in the province was composed of those teachers; the others were, for the greater part, former pupils, trained under their care during many years, first, as attendants to the classes of the primary schools, and finally, as pupils of the normal classes. We had normal schools which had been in existence since 1883. To get admission, the applicants had to satisfy the Board of Education that they were sufficiently educated to be able to at least take the subjects of second class teacher certificates. The course was of two years, during which they both taught and were taught. At the end of each year they passed an examination and were granted, on satisfactory evidence of their ability, the certificate of second class after the first year, and first class after the second year.

The course of training comprised the subjects taught in our schools, but to a higher degree, and besides a special course in pedagogics. Let us, for the sake of argument, admit for a moment that some of these teachers might not have realized the expectations of the school authorities; surely when it is said that none of them were fit for their position, after such a training, it must strike your mind that such an assertion is of necessity and to say the last, a gross exaggeration and misleading. And any man attempting to mislead public opinion in this way gives just ground to the public for not attaching to his utterances, on any subject, the importance which they might otherwise merit.

As to teachers who could not take the normal school course, they had nevertheless to pass an examination on the same subjects as the normal school teachers. The subjects on which they were examined were—in French and English as follows:—

EXAMINATION FOR TEACHERS.

Third Class Diploma.

To obtain this diploma, the candidates must get 75 per cent on the total marks, and thirty-five per cent on each subject.

The examination is on the following subjects:—

1. Religious instruction.—Rudiments of the Catholic Doctrine.
2. Deportment.—Cleanliness, due regard to parents, to old age, to dignitaries, to masters; reverence in the House of God. Benevolence and politeness towards companions and strangers; good demeanour in the streets, in society: politeness at table, in private and general conversation.
3. Spelling.—From the 3 first Readers.
4. Reading.—The 3 first books of Dominion Readers, Latin pronunciation, reading of manuscript.
5. Dictation and definition.—Selected passages from various authors.
6. Grammar.—Elements of Grammar, parsing and corresponding exercises.
7. Composition.—Narrations on easy and common subjects, Correspondence.
8. Writing.—On copy books No. 1, 2, 3 and 4.
9. History.—Sacred History, and general notions on the History of Canada.
10. Geography.—Geographical definitions, America—especially Canada—and Europe.
11. Arithmetic.—Mental exercises, the arithmetic up to Interest, included.
12. Drawing.—1st and 2nd part of the preliminary course—(Temple).
13. Vocal Music.—Plain chant.
14. Useful knowledge.—General notion of the senses, division of time, measures in use, currency; on water, dew, clouds, rain, hail, snow; on the earth, the sun, the moon, the star, lightning and thunder, the winds, and points of the compass.

Second Class Diploma.

To obtain this diploma, the candidates must get 60 per cent on the total marks, and 30 per cent on each subject.

The examination is on the following subjects:—

1. Everything as required for 3rd class certificate, and moreover:—
2. Religious instruction.—Historical, Doctrinal, Moral and Liturgical exposition of the Catholic Religion.—(First half).
3. Deportment.—Etiquette in writing letters.
4. Spelling.—From the 4th and 5th Dominion Readers.
5. Reading.—4th and 5th Dominion Readers, Latin pronunciation and reading of manuscript.
6. Dictation and definition.—Selected passages from various authors, and the use of synonymous.
7. Grammar.—Syntax, corresponding analysis and exercises.
8. Composition.—On giving subjects with or without a given sketch, analysis of selected narrations and of discourses.
9. Writing.—On the whole series of copy books.
10. History.—Complete knowledge of the History of Canada, up to our times, and general notions on the history of France and England.

11. Geography.—Mathematical, physical and political—Asia, Africa, Oceania.
12. Arithmetic.—The whole of the arithmetic, mensuration, book-keeping.
13. Geometry.—Elementary course.
14. Algebra.—To the end of the equations of the 1st degree, (exclusive of the indeterminate.)
15. Useful knowledge.—Element of physics and hygiene, notions on the animal kingdom.
16. Vocal Music.—Anthems, hymns, psalms.
17. Drawing.—Linear drawing and drawing of maps.
18. Agriculture.—General notions on agricultural produce.

First Class Diploma.

To obtain this diploma, the candidates must get 50 per cent of the total marks, and 25 per cent on each subject.

The examination is on the following subjects:—

1. Everything as required for the 2nd and 3rd class diploma, and moreover:
2. Religious instruction.—Historical, doctrinal, moral and liturgical exposition of the Catholic Religion—(second half).
3. Deportment.—Order of precedence, forms of address to persons of rank.
4. Spelling, Reading.—Poetry.
5. Dictation.—Selected passages, in poetry, from various authors.
6. Definition.—Of poetical expressions.
7. Grammar.—Thorough knowledge of grammar, prosody and logical analysis.
8. Composition.—On various subjects and discourses.
9. Writing.—On the whole series of copy books, and exercises on commercial forms.
10. History.—History of France and England.
11. Geography.—Mathematical, physical and political, complete course.
12. Arithmetic.—Cubic measurement and book-keeping.
13. Geometry.—Intermediate course.
14. Algebra.—To the end of the equations of the 1st degree.
15. Useful knowledge.—Elements of Botany and Chemistry, (organic and inorganic) and general notions of Geology, especially of the Canadian Provinces.
16. Vocal Music.—Hymns and Songs.
17. Drawing.—Geometrical figures.
18. Agriculture.—The soil and its preparation, cultivation of vegetables.

And moreover, for each certificate of the three classes, every candidate must, to the satisfaction of the examiners, undergo an examination on the Art of teaching in general, and, in particular, of teaching the branches corresponding to the degree of the diploma applied for.

The care of the Board of Education did not stop there. Apart from the first class certificates, which were, during the last year, made permanent, the other certificates were issued only for three years, thus obliging the teachers not to let their minds rest in inactivity, forcing them to continually work and study in order to post themselves for their next examination, and consequently

giving ground for a reasonable hope of their yearly improvement. At present there are some of those teachers engaged in their professional work in the North-west at high salaries, showing that they have been found fit for such a position. Even the inspector of the Manitoba government cannot refrain from giving them, though in a half-hearted way, a compliment as to their ability. He says in his report for 1894:

As a rule the teachers have the ability and energy to do good work, but they lack the normal school training.

Can teachers who possess ability and energy to do good work, be said to be totally unfit for their situation, even if they lack a normal school training, which was not the case with most of them? One province of Canada, in 1893, had 997, teachers, of whom 222 were untrained, 392 who had but third class certificates, and 53 with interim certificates, and this for 718 schools—a total of 445 teachers having only third class certificate, or no certificate at all, employed in 718 schools. That province is under the school regime which the Catholics of Manitoba are asked to accept. Do you care to have its name? It is the province of Manitoba, under the new regime. Does such a record entitle the government of Manitoba, or their supporters, to speak disparagingly of the other schools?

I do not want to leave this matter of the teachers without mentioning the fact that so anxious was our Board of Education to help the teachers in their work and to secure their intellectual advancement, that each one of them was regularly supplied, free to him, with a monthly educational publication. Besides our board had framed certain rules which they had constantly before them. These regulations are as follows:—

Article XV. Besides the duties which are to them prescribed by law, the teachers ought to pay strict attention to the following rules:

1. To begin and to end the school by morning and evening prayers, such as are taught in the catechism.
2. To be watchful as to cleanliness and good order in the school and its dependences.
3. To exact that the children be polite, clean and assiduous, that they shall avoid in going to school and in returning home all that would be unbecoming.
4. To endeavour especially to inspire in the children the love of God so that they will act rather for the sake of duty than through selfish motives.
5. To never lose the opportunity to inculcate in the hearts of the children principles of honesty, truthfulness, and all those virtues without which

knowledge would be prejudicial rather than profitable.

6. To win the respect of the scholars by exemplary conduct in all things.

7. To encourage the affection and confidence of their scholars by worthy and conciliating behaviour.

8. To avoid and abstain from triviality and a too great familiarity in manner and language.

9. To beware against all partiality or unjust distinction between children.

10. To never allow themselves to pass any unfavourable remarks in regard to the parents, especially in presence of the children.

11. To subdivide the classes and teach the matters according to the programme of studies.

Article XVI. When the number of children attending a school regularly is more than fifty, the trustees shall appoint an assistant to the teacher.

It has been alleged that the standard of our teachers' examination was not sufficiently high. I have shown by the figures just above mentioned that more than half the schools of Manitoba under the new regime are attended by low grade teachers and in that respect they have no right to assail others. But to return, and in support of the above assertion, some questions put to the candidates at such examination, have been cited as an evidence of the insufficient qualification of the teachers. The way that kind of argument is being brought forward is most discreditable. It consists in picking out of a large number of subjects and questions, a few of these, so as to cast ridicule on the whole examination. After all, it only shows the disingenuousness of our opponents. For instance, they cite examples in four subjects, but they leave out ten other subjects, including pedagogics, grammar, composition, rhetoric, logical analysis, arithmetic, algebra, drawing, agriculture, object lessons, the latter including some rudiments of botany, chemistry and physics. Evidently, such a mode of dealing with the question is not fair. But let us examine more closely into these quotations.

One of them has reference to deportment :

(1) How is a letter addressed, when written to a prelate, a priest, to a professional man. How are such letters concluded?

In conversation, what titles do you employ in speaking to those same persons?

This is simple enough, I admit. Yet, I know some quarters where there is still more simplicity in that respect: they dispense entirely with that subject in education, and it is no wonder that the result is thus indicated in the United States, whose system is offered us as a model. I read from an article in the *Evening Post* of New York, published in 1889 :

The result is that in all probability our youth is the most ill-bred of the whole civilized world.

Mr. Ewart, our distinguished solicitor before the court, said in his argument before the Cabinet Council in Canada, last winter :

As to those questions....all can say is that I wish that they had been taught in the schools when I was young.

If such wishes as those expressed by Mr. Ewart were realized, such instances as the following would not perhaps take place: one day a Catholic clergyman of our province, who is a member of the examining staff in the University of Manitoba, was invited by the principal of a Protestant high school to pay him a visit. The invitation was accepted, and the priest went to the high school, but in exchange for this courteous act towards the principal of the school, he was saluted with hissing by the pupils. About letters, it is true that the plain, artless and easy forms such as "your's truly" or even the shorter "your's" which are found at the bottom of so many letters, do not require much cleverness or application, and perhaps they are right in the so-called public schools in not paying much attention to such trivial matters, but since they choose to dispense with that sort of thing, they have no right to complain of what we do in that direction, however little it may be. Be that as it may, we are not left entirely without some comfort, if we proceed to make comparisons.

In one of the public teachers' examinations the following question was asked:—"How many legs has a spider?" I do not know whether the candidate answered right, but I cannot help thinking that the teaching of good deportment to children is much more important to them than to be taught about the number of legs of a spider. Another question which is found fault with is the following:—"What is the capital of England?" Well, this is not the whole question that was put on geography, but it has been picked up and presented as above in order to produce a better effect. There were other questions on the same subject, such as the following:—"Draw the continental limits of North and South America, tracing all the countries, rivers and mountains, and locating the capitals and most important cities of each country." But let us take the first question as it was brought out by our opponents. That is a simple question, I admit, but if I look at the examination

papers of the Protestant schools I find such questions as this for a first class teacher—for instance, "What is a verb?" Is not the latter as simple as the former? First-class teachers were asked to parse such words as: we, voice, like, with, etc. Second class teachers were asked to spell the words "sugar, pleasant, truly, Wednesday, February, accommodation," and a few other words, and the examiners in their report say: "The number of mis-spelled words found in the pupils' papers was professedly unaccountable to the teacher, but extremely suggestive to the examiner." Here is another question which is most suggestive:

Which of the following sentences has the better arrangement? Why?

(a.) The French idea of liberty is: the right of every man to be master of the rest; in practice, at least, if not in theory.

(b.) Whatever it may be in theory, it is clear that in practice the French idea of liberty is: the right of every man to be master of the rest.

Quoting the words of an eminent priest in Winnipeg, Rev. Mr. Cherrier, I might say:

Nice reflections, is it not, on French ethics! Let the arrangement of the sentence be as it may, I have no hesitation in saying that in the present instance the examiner could not but instil very strange and altogether unjust and false principles regarding the French idea of liberty.

I would add: How can we rely on such people for the education of our youths? Shall we be compelled to expose our children to such insults to our own blood and to such a distortion of facts and doctrine? I might give these quotations at greater length, but I desire to turn my attention to something more serious. Reference is made to questions as to religious and morals in a way which discloses a lamentable ignorance of our Catholic belief. The following are the questions:—

What is the Church? Where is the true church? Ought we to believe what the Catholic Church teaches us, and why?

These are the questions which are sneered at. Any one conversant with the Catholic religion and morals knows that to answer these questions is almost giving the whole economy of the Church and the cardinal points of Catholic belief. It does not become any one who contemplates divorcing religion from the schools, or who is satisfied with the mere reading of a few selections from the Bible, such only as are authorized by the state, to speak with levity of our examina-

tion or of our teaching in religious matters. In connection with this subject I may mention one important thing to be considered: it is the difference of the circumstances and consequently the necessary difference in the object aimed at. In the examination held by the other section they aimed at qualifying teachers not only for the primary schools, but also for high schools, collegiate institutes, and for the principalship of intermediate institutions, but we had no such organization. Our children leaving the primary schools go direct to our college, an institution receiving no public money and where they find professors who are themselves members of the university staff. Owing then to the difference of the work they were called upon to perform, we felt, and I still feel that we would not have been justified in exacting from them such qualifications as would fit them for such high work for which there was no field, and which was not in our gift.

Now, hon. gentlemen, it seems when we hear those critics that everything should be perfection in the other camp. We have not been in the habit of looking through the windows of our neighbours, but since we are taken to task so severely, let us for once pull the curtain aside, just a little bit, and see whether one could not also find fault. I have already called your attention to the low grade of at least one-half of the total number of teachers in the other schools and to the deficiency found in spelling such easy words as sugar, Wednesday, February, &c. In our examinations we would not think of giving any paper on spelling. It is too easy work, in our opinion. But it appears that something of that kind is needed in what are called national or public schools, and to keeps ourselves at their level, we had to introduce that subject in our examinations. I am a witness to the fact that some years ago there were so many mistakes in the grammatical writing of the English candidates at the university examinations that the matter was taken into consideration by some of the committees of the council. The question arose whether those mistakes should not be counted in the correction of these papers, even on subjects not connected with grammatical examination. Yet, these students came from the so-called perfect schools, under highly qualified teachers, such as we were held incapable of having. And even during the last years what do you find?

In 1887 some of the inspectors of Protestant schools complained of the "continued scarcity of trained and certificated teachers." Another said: "The principal defect in the teaching was ignorance on the part of some teachers of the proper methods of instruction." The superintendent, speaking of certain difficulties they were labouring under, concludes by saying "that such difficulties necessitate the issuing of temporary licenses to a number of persons who are not fully qualified by training or literary attainment for teaching" I do not refer to this with a view to finding fault. I am satisfied that the best that could be done was effectively done. Considerable allowance must be made in a new province like ours, with a scattered population and with a class of population not supposed to be well off at the beginning of its settlement. The immigrants are coming to the west for the purpose of improving their condition in that respect; but if allowance is made for the Protestant section, why not do the same for our section?

I might go on citing instances, I might recall the letter of a parent in the *North-West* of the 20th or 21st January, 1895, complaining of the cramming system in vogue in the public schools and winding up his complaint with these words: "If the system is persisted in I will have to remove my child, as I had to do with an older sister."

I could also refer to a lecture given in Winnipeg by Rev. Prof. Stewart in January last, finding fault with the normal school of the province, and referring to a case where a young lady of 16 years of age only was appointed principal of a large school. In the same lecture the reverend gentleman complained of the direction given to instruction:

At present, the trend is all towards the teacher's certificate. As soon as a boy got up in his class he began to think about a third class certificate. And when he got that certificate he had either to get a school and teach or else become a failure. The pupil had become too far advanced to soil his fingers with a trade or with farming.

In 1893, the *Free Press*, of Winnipeg, said that out of every twenty children there was not one whose writing, on leaving the schools, had the required qualifications for business. What is called the public school system, as distinguished from the separate public school system, does exist elsewhere. It is in operation in Ontario and especially in the United States. Is everybody satisfied

with it, even amongst the non-Catholics? In November, 1893, a correspondent of the *Globe* wrote as follows:

The educational advantages (?) offered by the much vaunted public school system of Ontario, as exemplified by some of the schools in this city, are not quite up to the standard claimed by interested advocates for them. In these days of keen competition, the only thing needed is a good commercial education. The public schools were specially designed to impart this knowledge, but on the whole, have signally failed to do so.

The *Daily Spectator*, Hamilton, of November 28, 1894, said:

We find that while Mr. Ross's system (Ontario) with 10,000 separate exhibits won only 47 awards—3 of them given to please somebody—the much despised schools of Quebec, unenlightened, ignorant, unlearned Quebec, with 10,000 separate exhibits, won 60 awards, none of them begged. Put it another way: Ontario received one award for every 213 exhibits; Quebec one award for every 166 exhibits.

... The time may come when Ontario people will cease to make the worn out boast that this province has the best system of education in the world. The time will come when deluded Ontario people will acquire some knowledge of some other system of education.

The *Empire* of 24th April, 1890, speaks of the oppressive monopolies for publishing school text books established for a term of years:

The outrageously high prices charged to pupils whose parents have to foot the bills.

The holding of bogus arbitrations so transparently absurd as to constitute an insult to the electors.

The gradual growth of bureaucracy and political scheming in educational administration.

Continual vexations and unnecessary changes in the text books to increase ministerial patronage.

It must be obvious that a system open to so many objections, is not perfect enough to justify its advocates in thinking themselves superior in point of wisdom to the bishops of the Catholic church.

Inspector Kelly, of the county of Brant, in 1893, reported:

We in Ontario are prone to boast, and not without a show of reason, of the excellence of our school system. Theoretically it is better than that of any of the neighbouring states, and so far as the primary schools go, better than that of England, Ireland or Scotland. But it is not perfect; those who say so, merely show how narrow their intellectual horizon is. Its cost, especially in the cities, is ever present with us, but its results have for the most part yet to declare themselves.

In the report of the Minister of Education in 1889, Inspector Mitchell, of Lanark county, stated:

A large number of rural pupils over, say, thirteen years of age, are receiving practically no instruction.

Inspector Johnston, of Leeds county, said :

The only serious obstacle in the way of educational advancement is the low grade of teachers—the teacher sometimes does not know history or geography enough to give the class a few minutes' drill without the aid of the book. Grammar in some schools is viewed with reverential fear and dread; the pupils, apparently, think that it is worse than useless, and the teacher has not sufficient tact to dispel unmeaning prejudices.

In the 1892 report of the Minister of Education for Ontario we find the following :

In the county of Lanark there were 134 teachers in 1891 : 3 first class, 8 second class, 97 third class, 28 temporarily qualified. * * *

It seems to be a reproach to the intelligence and progressiveness of a county such as ours that so many third class recruits are constantly employed.

Inspector Craig, in 1893, reported :

The condition of the schools in the inspectorate is not very satisfactory : there is an evident lack of interest in educational matters in many of the rural sections, and in some cases this lack of interest has developed into a positive opposition to improvement and progress in school matters ; too often the rate-payer elected to fill this office of trustee is a person whose sole object is to curtail expenses and reduce the school tax to a minimum. This leads to a demand for cheap and, consequently, inferior teachers, and as a necessary result, inferior schools.

The investigation in the Toronto University has revealed weak spots. Are we, therefore, to condemn that very high institution, and its professors ?

And now, if I am permitted to turn my attention to the results obtained in the United States, here is a sample of the judgments which have been passed upon them.

A newspaper in California, *The Alta*, said in 1872, "that if we are to judge this system by its apparent fruits, we shall have to pronounce it not only a melancholy, but a most disastrous failure." If we come back to the eastern states, we find one Mr. George A. Walton, agent of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, setting forth as follows the condition of the public schools in a locality bordering on Boston where the inhabitants are somewhat exceptional in wealth. His report is summarized by the *Chicago Times*, and it says :

The examinations were, in the first place, of the simplest and most practical character. The showing made by some of the towns was excellent.

In the case of others, and of many others, it is evident that the scholars of fourteen years of age did not know how to read, to write or to cipher. They could, it is true—rattle off rules in grammar and arithmetic, not one word of which they understood—if they were called upon to write the shortest of letters or the simplest of compositions, or to go through the plainest of arithmetical combinations, their failure was complete. They had, in fact, been taught what to them were conundrums without end ; but the idea that the teaching was to be of any practical use in the lives of these children, when they grew to be American men and women, formed no part of the system, and evidently had never entered into the heads of the instructors. Then, when the letters and compositions were brought in, the ingenuity in bad spelling seems simply incredible. Unless the different misspellings of the word "scholar" for instance, were given, as in this volume, they are, who would believe that they would be some two hundred and thirty in number ? Then, sixty-five different spellings are enumerated of the word "depot" ; one hundred and eight of the common word "repose" ; and fifty-eight of "which." Out of eleven hundred and twenty-two pupils who used the adverb "too" in the narrative, eight hundred and fifty-nine or nearly seventy-five per cent of the whole, spelled the word incorrectly. Then we are given *facsimile* lithographs of these letters and compositions, showing their average excellence in certain of the towns, and anything worse it would be hard to conceive.

Mr. Charles Francis Adams, jr., in a paper on "New departure in the Common Schools of Quincy," wrote :

It appeared as a result of eight years' school teaching, that the children, as a whole, could neither write with facility nor read fluently.

Mr. Richard Grant White, one of the foremost and brightest thinkers in the United States, wrote an article in the *North American Review*, December, 1880, on the American school system. In the course of that article he says :

There is probably not one of those various social contrivances, political engines, or modes of common action called institutions, which are regarded as characteristic of the United States, if not peculiar to them, in which the people of this country have placed more confidence, or felt a greater pride, than its public school system. There is not one of them so unworthy of either confidence or pride, not one which has failed so completely to accomplish the end for which it was established. * * * According to independent and competent evidence from all quarters, the mass of the pupils of these public schools are unable to read intelligently, to spell correctly, to write legibly, to describe understandingly the geography of their own country, or to do anything that reasonably well educated children should do with ease. They cannot write a simple letter ; they cannot do readily, and with quick comprehension a simple "sum" in practical arithmetic ; they cannot tell the meaning of any but the commonest of the words that they read and spell so ill. * * * Crime and

vice have increased almost *pari-passu* with the development of the public school system, which, instead of lifting the masses, has given us in their place a non-descript and hybrid class.

I may be asked what is my object in making those quotations? Is it intended to use them as a condemnation of the public school question? My answer is that it is not. It may be or may not be a condemnation of that system, but that is not my object now. My only object is to show that this system also partakes of human weakness, and that if our Catholic schools have weak points the others are not without their own defects. I will add this: Up to the present time, we have refrained from passing judgment upon the public schools. We have stood upon the defensive. But I am bound to say, if that kind of warfare is maintained against us, we will have to change our ways. We will take the offensive. We will carry the war into the other camp. The quotations that I have made must show to all sensible people how easy it would be for us to indict the so-called public school system under all its aspect. I have a pile of such information and documents. I might add, for instance that according to the Census Bulletin No. 17, it is shown that—

The adult population—

—these are the words of the bulletin—of New Brunswick is not as generally able to read and write as it was twenty years ago; whereas the advance in education of the juvenile population of Quebec, between ten and twenty years of age, has been greater than that of any similar group in any of the other provinces.

Is it not a strange retribution? Twenty-four years ago the great argument thundered forth against separate schools in New Brunswick was that they would lead to the same illiteracy that existed in Quebec. Accordingly, New Brunswick refused to give a legal status to the separate schools, and has ever since been retrograding. Quebec keeps her separate schools and has made greater strides than any other part of the Dominion. That is the testimony of the census. Whilst on this subject I desire to enlarge the scope of my remarks. It is not only the Catholic schools of Manitoba that are assailed; it is the whole system of Catholic education, and use is made of the alleged inferiority of Catholic education elsewhere to convince the country at large that it would be bad policy to restore to the minority of Manitoba its rights. It gives to that

general aspect of the question an undeniable importance. Nothing is further from the truth, hon. gentlemen, than the broad and persistent accusations against the Catholic church that she aims at keeping the people in ignorance. From the very beginning of her existence she undertook to dispense largely, and gratuitously, not education only, but instruction. She opened schools and already in the second century there were Catholic institutions flourishing in Alexandria, which was then a centre of learning. All the arts and sciences of the time were taught in those schools. A panegyrist of Origen, who was a professor in that city, speaks in the following way of his methods:

Before receiving students, he used to examine them by a series of questions to discover their defects, and to try and correct them. He then taught them logic to whet their understanding—not, however, the logic common with ordinary philosophers, but the logic of common sense, which is necessary to all, Greeks or barbarians, the learned and the unlearned, in short for all men whatever vocation they may choose to follow. To logic he added natural philosophy, which he taught in such a manner as to illustrate and classify every single object, to reduce it by a simple exposition to its first elements, and explain the nature of the whole and its parts, and the serious changes to which it has subject. This he did to inspire the pupil with a rational instead of an irrational admiration of nature. Then the student was introduced to the study of geometry, the firm and unshaken basis of all the other sciences; and astronomy, which contemplates the firmament, and leads to the sublime and heavenly. After these preparatory studies, he is taught moral philosophy, and herein Origen exhibited to all in himself a golden mirror of virtue and piety. He taught the student particularly to enter into his own spirit; to provide for the soul above all other things, and to practise piety. He then read with them the writings of ancient philosophers and poets, except those who denied the Providence of God, for these were not considered fit to be read, lest by them the soul should be defiled. The student was made familiar with all the philosophical systems, wherein the teacher accompanied him in spirit, as on a journey, and led him, as it were, by the hand when any thing abstruse, doubtful or deceptive presented itself: or like an expert swimmer, to whom nofeat is unknown or untried, who being himself secure from all danger, stretches forth his hand to extricate and save others from drowning. The course of study was concluded with the exposition of the sacred books and the christian philosophy.

This long passage shows how the church, from the earliest ages, was solicitous to teach not only the christian doctrine, but the whole cyclopaedia of the known sciences. Alexandria was not the only christian seat of learning of this kind in the first centuries.

besides, history, geography, literature and rhetoric, book-keeping, geometry, architecture, natural history, mechanics, cosmography, music, and some other subjects, like modern languages, &c. In his instructions he says: "We must teach to children but useful things, of which they may be able to avail themselves in after life. The teaching must be practical, and in connection with the state of life to which the child is destined. To teach children the theory and the advantages of the art which they study is a very useful thing, but practice is more necessary than theory." These rules, which are still at the bottom of the Catholic education, show that we are not content with the reciting of prayers or of the catechism, as some are inclined to believe, but that we strive for a good, practical, and useful education, in order to put every child in a position to hold his own in this world and to be a good citizen and a good christian. This aim has been so successfully attained, and that result is so widely known, that our teaching religious orders have been called upon to open schools all over Canada and the United States. From Halifax to Vancouver, from New York to San Francisco, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean, these able, devoted, and unselfish teachers are found giving their whole and undivided attention, untrammelled by all earthly ties, free from the clogging influences of wordly affections, to the work of education. We find them amongst the Indians, knowing no differences, and imparting to all with the same love and zeal, the godly gift of knowledge. If those teachers were not fit for their work, would they be so universally desired and invited to take charge of the schools, whether primary or high schools? They would not be able to subsist; they would be wiped out of existence. But instead of that, the requests they receive are so numerous, that they are obliged to refuse some of the calls made upon them. Their achievements in the United States have been such as to elicit the following remarks from a Protestant paper in San Francisco, speaking of a Catholic institution in Oakland, California, under the control of the same order to which are entrusted some of our schools in Manitoba:

It is a home where moral and religious teaching go hand in hand with mental and physical training giving healthy action to both brain and soul. The secular curriculum is of the highest order, and the

convent of the Sacred Heart has, in the thoroughness of its methods and the scholarship of those who have been educated within its walls, attained an enviable reputation throughout the state.

I have already referred to the success achieved by the Catholic schools of Quebec at the Chicago Columbian Exhibition. I desire, however, to put on record here some testimony of the high appreciation of which they have been the object. I will first quote from the report of our Canadian superintendent of the liberal arts at Chicago during the exhibition. Mr. Morton says in his report, page 42, of the general report of the Executive Commissioners of Canada :

The province of Quebec in this her almost first school exhibit presented to the many millions who visited the fair an extensive, artistic and instructive display. The Reverend Abbé Bruchési had under his charge nearly four hundred schools, representing various religious institutions throughout the province, the primary schools, the University of Laval and Laval Normal School. The display made by the 100 schools of the convent of Notre Dame of Montreal representing 24,000 pupils, elicited much admiration. The excellence attained in those studies peculiar to young ladies, was the most characteristic feature of this exhibit. The Christian Brothers' schools were largely represented by exhibits in drawing, writing and studies in commercial work. They represented nearly 20,000 pupils, and their most marked characteristic was the excellence of the writing, penmanship that was equalled by none at the World's Fair. The primary schools had a good showing in every day school work. The result of this exhibit made by Quebec must dispel the idea wherever it prevails that she is not progressing in education.

The report of Mr. Morton contains also the following lines :

Mr. Serrurier, representative of the French Minister of Education, and author of the inductive method of teaching, said: He had made a minute examination of the several school exhibits, and declared they were the finest of the whole exhibition, not alone in intrinsic value, but because of their admirable arrangement. At this great fair Canada gives an example which should be followed by the older nations of the earth.

I know that these remarks of Mr. Serrurier refer more particularly to the exhibit of the province of Quebec. That gentleman wrote to the Abbé Bruchési in this way :

I have been amazed by the intelligent way in which your exhibits are classified * * * Your copy books are the only ones having clear and precise headings conveying to the observer the information desired as to the school, the standard, number of pupils, the age, &c., I have also noticed with pleasure that the every day school work, in all the standards, bears with it a tone of sincerity which is very seldom found at exhibitions.

There were similar institutions in Jerusalem, Antioch, Edessa, Caesarea, Nisibis, Neocæsarea, Nicomedia, Smyrna, Naziansus, Byzantium, Rome, Carthage, Hippo, Lyons, and other places. These were for adults, which presupposes the existence of primary schools where these adults had received the rudiments of knowledge before going to those high institutions. In fact, there were schools attached to the churches and supported by them. In the second century we trace a priest, named Progenes, who at Edessa taught the children to read and write and sing the psalms. In the fourth century we find St. Basil the Great, making the education of the youth one of the chief ministries of the monks, and giving them circumstantial hints on the method of teaching. Soon the priests exerted themselves to gather a circle of boys around them to whom they imparted the rudiments of knowledge. This practice was sanctioned by the ecumenical council at Constantinople in 681, which prescribed that schools be opened in all parishes. So a school was attached to each monastery. And when the tide of the barbarians had almost swept away every vestige of civilization in Europe, from whence did come the light which dispelled the darkness hovered over the face of the continent? There was a tiny islet in the western sea, and in that "Gem of the Ocean," almost out of the reach of civilization, were found schools by the hundreds and students by tens of thousands, who soon shed their lustre all over the world. The fame of those institutions were such as to attract students from all parts of Europe, even from the classic shore of Hellas. And the sons of the Catholic and enlightened Ireland turned out and went to bear the good tidings of the Gospel, of science and civilization to the Scot, to the Anglo-Saxon, to the German, to the Swiss and the Gaul. Such were their exertions and influence that a German writer of the ninth century (Emmerich von Reichenau) exclaims with the warmth peculiar to his times: "O, how could we ever forget Erin, from which such light and splendour has dawned upon us!"

Before the reformation there were no less than 66 European Catholic universities of note, of which Italy had 17; Germany, 14; France, 12; Spain and Portugal, 10; England, 2; Scotland, 3; other countries, 5. In the fourteenth century the University of Boulogne numbered 13,000 students, and

(including fellows, tutors and students) formed a body of 30,000. The number of years devoted to study, exclusive of the preparatory course, was generally 7 for arts and 12 for professional branches (theology, medicine and law), making in all at least 19 years of higher studies. These institutions turned out men like Alfred the Great, Alcuin, St. Bernard, Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Alexander of Hales, Roger Bacon, Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer or Sir Thomas Moore, thinkers, writers and polished geniuses, who not being subjected to our barbarous and criminal cramming, had something more in their intellects than a mere smattering of everything, and to whom humanity and education owe more than to the noisy educationist of our days. True it may be, natural sciences were not as far advanced as they are to-day, but to make a reproach of that would be equivalent to blaming Sir Isaac Newton for not inventing the telephone or the electric light. The church had then not only provided for high education, but she had also primary schools established. At the beginning of the fifteenth century the diocese of Prague, which covered a comparatively limited area, had at least 640 elementary schools. Taking that number as a basis, it would have given for Germany alone 40,000 elementary schools. In the year 1378 we find sixty-three lay teachers occupied in elementary schools. I could go on in the same strain with all the countries, but is not this sufficient evidence that the church is far from being opposed to education? She has founded the first schools in Christendom. She has saved the remnants of ancient civilization. She has given birth to those great institutions of learning which have been the cradles of genius and seats of literature and philosophy. With many it seems as if the normal schools were of a recent foundation. The fact is that as far back as the year 1684, we find a priest, the venerable Jean Baptiste de la Salle, establishing a normal school under the name School Teachers Seminary. The course which he advocated contained for elementary or primary schools: sacred history, religious instruction, reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, rudiments of book-keeping, coin system, weights and measures, drawing, singing, the drafting of the forms used in the ordinary civil acts, and deportment; for the Model school, he had,

The *Pilot* of Boston also said, June 5th, 1893 :

These exhibits speak for themselves. They reveal the devotedness, the ability of the teachers, the attention and talents of the pupils. Nothing better could be found in the art gallery.

On the 29th of August, 1893, the *Daily Sun*, of St. John, New Brunswick, said :

The province of Quebec, the oldest in Canada, has made an exhibition of her school system which, to judge from the quality and of the number of the exhibits, will contribute to dispel many false ideas as to her degree of civilization * * * In drawing, writing models for teaching the blind, education of deaf and mutes and, in fact, generally all that leads to the advancement of a country and a people in an educational point of view, Quebec schools to-day are in the front ranks.

Mr. Jones, a distinguished member of the House of Commons, who had gone to Chicago with prejudices against some of the Quebec school, declared after a careful examination of the Quebec school display that he had "to shake off his own prejudices" and he adds : "Our school exhibition is the most practical of all that I have ever seen, and I have seen quite a number" * * * "With a great deal of pride I say that the Canadian school exhibition is one of the finest, perhaps the best, in the whole Liberal Arts Gallery." The success of Quebec in Chicago, our own schools had elsewhere, under quite similar circumstances. Though I have already laid before the Senate evidence to that effect, allow me to put again on record a statement of our success at Portage la Prairie, in 1883, where we obtained prizes in cash, and diplomas for our school exhibition ; at London, at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, where we obtained diplomas, the only reward given there.

The late Superintendent of Education in the province of Quebec, is a man of recognized experience and authority in the Dominion. On the occasion of the celebration of his tenth year in the administration of the department, the Protestant Committee in Quebec passed a resolution in which they placed on record :

Their high sense of the equity and ability with which his duties have been discharged and to congratulate him upon the advance which under his energetic superintendence, education has made, and is making, in the province.

This resolution justifies me in attaching a high importance to his testimony. Writing to the Catholic superintendent of the schools in Manitoba, while at London, and

after a careful examination of the school exhibition, he said :

After mature consideration, my opinion is that our Quebec system and yours, is as perfect as any other now in force elsewhere.

Our opponents may talk as much as they please after that of our alleged illiteracy ; they will not be believed. There is no more illiteracy amongst the Catholics than amongst the non-Catholics. There is less boasting, but there is as much eagerness for education and as much knowledge. That charge of illiteracy, as I have already said, is not peculiar to our province. It is the old and usual charge that is always made by some people against Catholics generally and their church, a charge of which honest and well-informed Protestants disapprove. A man whose repute does not necessarily fall before that of the men composing our Manitoba Government, Mr. Gladstone, has said :

Since the first three hundred years of persecution the Roman Catholic church has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilization, and has driven harnessed to its chariot as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world ; its learning has been the learning of the world : its art the art of the world ; its genius the genius of the world ; its greatness, glory, grandeur and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has had to boast.

"The praise of having originally established schools," says Hallam, "belongs to some abbots and bishops of the sixth century."

Ranke also says :

A sure and unbroken progress of intellectual culture has been going on in the bosom of the Catholic Church for a series of ages. The vital and productive elements of human culture were here mingled and united.

A Presbyterian writer, Laing, in his "Notes of a Traveller," made the following statements in 1842 :

The education of the clergy of the Catholic Church is positively higher and, beyond doubt, comparatively higher than the education of the Scotch clergy. * * * It is much to the zeal and assiduity of the priesthood in diffusing instruction in the useful branches of knowledge, that the revival and spread of Catholicism have been so considerable among the people of the continent.

Speaking of the assertion that the Catholic clergy leave people in ignorance, the same writer says :

This opinion of Protestants is more orthodox than charitable or correct. In Catholic Germany, France, Italy and even Spain, the education of the

common people in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners and morals is at least as generally diffused and as faithfully promoted by the clerical body as in Scotland. Education is in reality not only not repressed, but is encouraged by the popish church. In every street in Rome, for instance, there are at short distances, public primary schools for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes in the neighbourhood. Rome with a population of 158,678 souls, has 372 public primary schools, with 482 teachers and 14,099 children attending them. Has Edinburgh so many public schools for the instruction of those classes? I doubt it. Berlin, with a population about the double that of Rome, has only 264 schools. Rome has also her university with an average attendance of 660 students; and the Papal States with a population of two and one-half millions, contains seven universities. Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions has but seven. The statistical fact that Rome has above a hundred schools more than Berlin, for a population of little more than half of that of Berlin, puts to flight a world of humbug about the systems of national education carried on by governments and their moral effects on society.

Coming to a more recent date, we find in the official statistical books of Rome for 1869, the following data:—

	Pupils, Free.	Pupils, Paying.
Male instruction.....
Scientific institutions.	3,829
Elementary schools..	6,341	1,567
Female instruction.....
Convent and conservatories.....	2,954	553
Elementary schools..	6,490	2,171
	19,614	4,291

Grand total, 23,905, for a population at the same date of 220,532. This showing forbids all adverse criticism, and with the exception of a few, these students were taught free.

To those who concern themselves about having the inner thoughts of the Roman catholics on the progressive education which is their aim I would say: listen to these words of the present Pope, Leo XIII.:

How grand and full of majesty does man appear when he arrests the thunderbolt ** summons the electric flash * * how powerful when he takes possession of the force of steam * * Is there not in man when he does these things some spark of creative power? * * The church views these things with joy.

The perfection of primary education is to be found in Catholic Luxembourg. The governor of that province said in 1872:

Luxembourg counts at the present time 507 elementary schools—that is to say, one school to every four hundred inhabitants, and such results

have not been attained in any other country in Europe.

The number of pupils in the elementary schools exceeded fifteen per cent of the whole population. The year preceding the census proved that there were 31,580 children of an age to go to school, and the number of scholars actually attending the elementary schools was 31,239, so that only 341 children were missing, which produces one per cent, a result which has never been attained in any country in Europe, under any educational system.

In the *Dictionary of Statistics*, by Michael G. Mulhall, Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society, figures are given showing France at the head of the list for the average attendance of school children with 170 per 1,000 children, Belgium, 135 per 1,000, whilst the United States and England have only 130 and 123 respectively. Another table worthy of examination is to be found in the report of the United States Commissioner of Education. There the proportion of the enrolment of the children in school per 1,000 of population is given, and two Catholic countries, Bavaria and Baden, come at the head of the list with 212 enrolled children per 1,000 of population for the former country and 206 for the latter, while Prussia has only 196, England and Wales, 166; Scotland, 164. Two countries, one Protestant and the other Catholic, Denmark and Spain, may be bracketed, so small is the difference: Denmark being 110 and Spain 104.

As to the efficiency of the Catholic schools, it may be appreciated by the following facts:

Out of 239 pupils who obtained prize exhibitions in Paris in 1878, 242 belonged to the Christian Brothers' schools. Between 1847 and 1877, out of 1,445 such exhibitions, 1,145 were carried off by the Christian Brothers' boys, the public school candidates being the larger number, and the public schools had received 40,000 francs for support. (The Church Review, Protestant Episcopalian, July, 1890.)

In the same period of thirty-one years, of the whole number, 620, consisting of the first twenty leading scholars of each year, the Catholic boys numbered 527—thirty-one victories in thirty-one years, without a break. Another test—the obtaining of the *certificats d'études*, granted to all deserving students—was kept up for nine years. The results for that period show that of 9,499 certificates, the Catholic boys were 613 in the majority; and that the sum of the averages per school amounted to 194 for the Catholics, against only 55 for the public

school boys. In Belgium, the official gazette of that country, the *Moniteur*, gives the percentage obtained by the Catholic and public schools respectively at competitions for the years 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893. In 1890 the Catholic schools obtained 5.52 per cent; the public schools only 3.96. In 1891, the Catholic schools obtained 5.52; the public schools, 3.55. In 1892, the Catholic schools obtained 5.33; the public schools, 3.56. In 1893, the Catholic schools obtained 6.79; the public schools, 4.39.

The average marks for each competition was as follows:—

1890. Public schools, 132.1 on 200.
" Catholic 139.4 "
1891. Public " 142.1 "
" Catholic 142.6 "
1892. Public " 136.2 "
" Catholic 137.8 "
1893. Public " 146.0 "
" Catholic 150.4 "

The above figures and quotations must convince any fair minded man that there is no desire on the part of the Catholic church to keep the people in ignorance, and that the Catholic schools are turning out good scholars.

They answer fully the falsification of figures which are made purposely to arouse hostility against the Catholic schools. Such has been the case in the United States, where one Mr. Hawkins has impudently fabricated figures to suit his fancy and his animosity against parochial schools. Those Hawkins statistics, although refuted more than once, are made use of, are quoted and hurled at us from newspapers and public platforms by unscrupulous enemies, and they make their way through the people and succeed in deceiving friendly citizens who would otherwise be disposed to have the kindest regard for their fellow citizens and their feelings. And so are the accusations hurled at the Catholics of Manitoba at the present time. Those assertions are repeated, and in 25 or fifty years from now they will be re-edited by some parties, ignorant of the refutation, and again the public sentiment will be stirred up injudiciously, unfairly and unpatriotically. Let us hope, however, that day by day, the chances of those agitators will be lessened, and that a time may come when they will have no hold on the great majority of the people.

At six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

Hon Mr. BERNIER resumed his speech. He said: I have already stated the peculiar difficulties we had to contend with in our province on account of a large portion of the original population having Indian proclivities. The Protestant had not to contend with such difficulties to the same extent that we had. If it were true, as it has been said, that only 25 per cent of the half-breeds can read we should be credited with the fact that so many have received any education. Mr. Ewart, speaking in Winnipeg lately, said:

I am surprised to hear that it is so great. Dr. Bryce has compared the French half-breeds to the wild mustang, and the English to the patient roadsters, and he is right. The mother tongue of many of those called French is Cree, and their habits until recent years have been those of roving hunters and voyageurs. Why then charge the illiteracy to the Catholic schools. Why not as well charge it to the Protestant schools? Of this 25 per cent, how many owe their education to others than Catholics? Credit the Catholics? I say, with 25 per cent. Do not debit them with 75 per cent. Be fair! Is it not absurd also (even were Catholics responsible) to ask the same results from wild mustangs as from patient roadsters? In the United States educational census, there is a separate column for civilized Indians, coloured people, &c. It is not the best column.

Let us consider that accusation in the light of the statistics. I have already shown that in the percentage of the enrolment of children to the school population, there was only six per cent difference between the Protestant and Catholic schools, and that we were ahead in the percentage of the attendance to the enrolment. Such being the case, it is an impossibility that we should be behind the other section. To controvert that evidence it is alleged that a petition presented to the Government was covered with names of parties unable to sign it for themselves. Even if that were the case it would not be fair to condemn the whole system on one particular fact, which may be the result of certain particular circumstances. It is a fact, for instance, that too many amongst our farmers, and especially amongst the half-breeds (and for that I do blame them) very often by a misapprehension of the importance of their act, for fear of boasting, do not sign themselves their own names, although able to do so, but ask somebody else to do it for them. This is wrong, but it cannot afford sure ground to judge the

illiteracy of the people. But in this particular case there is something more. The assertion has been met by the following challenge. Rev. M. Cherrier, speaking at Winnipeg about two months ago, said :

As I wish to give a flat denial to Dr. Bryce's assertion that 4 only out of the 140 French half-bred ratepayers referred could sign their names, here is my proposal to the learned doctor : let him produce the list, and I will volunteer to go with witnesses chosen by him to all the survivors under 50 years of age, of those named in the said list, and I agree to pay all expenses if I fail to bring back another list showing a fair percentage of names written in the signer's own writing, he to sustain the said expenses if I succeed in proving that many more than four out of 140 could sign their names.

This is the challenge, hon. gentlemen, and it has never been taken up or answered.

And if we judge of public schools by the following they have no right to throw stones at our windows. Inspector Lang—report of the Department of Education Manitoba, 1893, page 30, says :

In nearly every school in this division a test was made to discover how many of the pupils above second standard could use correctly the following words: done, did; seen, said; set, sit. It was found that about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the pupils "done" their exercises, "seen" the cows, "set" in their seats, and were in the habit of "laying" down.

In the same report, page 29, he says :

There is considerable time lost during each day in many of the schools owing to lack of system in arranging the day's work.

There was no inspection of the Catholic schools, it is said. This again is an inaccurate statement. We had a staff of inspectors who did their work regularly at a sacrifice to themselves. The Protestant section had appointed clergymen to inspect their schools. It can be ascertained by referring to the report on the Protestant schools in 1886, page 35. We thought that we might in the same way avail ourselves of the ability of our clergymen, and we appointed several of them as inspectors. But while the inspectors of the other section were well remunerated from the public funds, our inspectors did their work, for a nominal sum, which our board gave them as a mere recognition of their devotion to our educational interests. The instructions given to those inspectors were that their duties were not only to visit the schools twice a year, but also to help in the working of the educational laws, and to give explanations of the same to trustees and teachers, and they were sup-

plied by our board with a series of 31 questions bearing on all the details of the school work, both as to teachers and pupils, of the school apparatus and furniture, and of the school house and the accommodation it afforded. Besides that, the trustees were urged by our board to comply with the School Act and visit the schools. Here is an extract of a circular that was addressed to them in 1884 :

School trustees are requested to conform to the clause of the Act which obliges them to visit the schools from time to time; it is desirable that they should forward to the superintendent a summary of their observations after each visit.

Moreover, by the School Act, clause 80, the resident priest was made a visitor of the schools in his mission, and I know that they did visit the schools and urge all they could the progress of the schools, and compliance with the law, and helped the cause of education by their advice to parents, teachers and pupils, and even to our Board of Education. And now, hon. gentlemen, to complete this information, I may add that the superintendent himself visited the schools. He had made it his duty to go all over the province, in order to show the ratepayers and the pupils the interest that was taken in the education of the youth, and thereby to encourage and properly direct the energy of the population to the cause of popular education. He did it also with the view of making himself personally acquainted with the population, with the trustees, with the teachers, with the locality, the school-house and everything belonging thereto, so as to be able the better to fulfil his own duties, to supply their wants, and to remedy the evils wherever they might exist. We do not contend that everything was perfect. We are human like others; but—others also have their deficiencies. Protestant schools had their drawbacks. To show it, it is only necessary to refer to their own reports. I take the reports of the inspectors at random. I will quote from some of the inspectors :

My examination of the schools has been uniform. In several schools I found that in some standards the work of the lower standard had not been mastered, arithmetic is the study that many of the standards are backward in, but when schools will be longer in operation than six months in each year, this weakness will be removed.

Another inspector speaking of the school at Dunstan said :

The progress of this school has been somewhat hindered by lack of proper accommodation.

Another inspector speaking also of another school says :

The lower school is very backward and will require the best efforts of the teacher.

Speaking of another school the same inspector says :

It is very backward and will require great diligence to bring it to good standing.

So they had their drawbacks as we had ours. As to ours we were willing to lessen them as much as possible. But, hon. gentlemen, there is more to be said about this. It is well known that this was not the cause of the change of the law. Political advantages were sought : that is all, and we were made the bone of contention. But, if, as they contend now, that was the cause of their action, why did they not avail themselves, before wiping out our schools, of the power given them, by the School Act, to improve them? By clause 80, they were constituted visitors of the schools—Catholics as well as Protestant schools. There were thirty-two Protestant English members of the legislature (including the Cabinet ministers) who had the right to visit our schools, and pass their remarks, and write them down in a book, which was ever at their disposal for that purpose. The judges of the Court of Queen's Bench had, by law, the same privilege. Did they avail themselves of that privilege? Not at all. Not one of those who are to-day arraigning our schools ever put a foot in them. They have never taken the proper means of acquainting themselves with the working of our schools. As our departed illustrious Mgr. Taché once said :

They know nothing but their own schools, and with self-commendation that characterizes men who know nothing but themselves and their immediate surroundings, pronounce the schools of others to be of no value.

As a matter of fact, I may add, they do not want to know. They prefer to resort to current prejudices and passions, sure to find followers ready to accept their unfounded assertions, without taking the trouble of looking into them. It is astonishing, as well as painful, to see how men, otherwise honest and intelligent, are sometimes easily led astray. For instance, there are many who base their objections to our schools on the testimony of one man, Mr. O'Donaghue, the gentleman sent up by the government of Manitoba as an accuser of our schools. That man appeared before the Privy Council in Ottawa ; every one there

present had an opportunity of listening to him and of judging of his own ability. He does not speak or understand our language ; he is not even able to master his own language ; he is not in a position to judge of the efficiency of an English school. Every body would see that when he appeared before the Privy Council his remarks, if at all reliable, applied to 1883 and 1884, and not to more recent years. Yet the government of Manitoba is willing to let its policy rest upon that man. By some, not only one particular school, but the whole school system, the whole Catholic population of Manitoba, in so far as education is concerned, are placed at the mercy of such a gentleman. That is so much opposed to ordinary common sense, that many would regret their hostility, if they were only willing to think over the matter for five minutes.

It has been said also that our schools were open but a few months in the year, but a few days during the week. This again is contrary to the facts. We exacted 200 school days in the year while it was a rule amongst a great number of Protestant districts to have no school in winter. The reports of the superintendent and of the inspectors are evidences of that. That rule was complied with and those who did not comply were but a very few exceptions, and had very good reasons. It is very difficult to meet such general assertions : very often a mere denial is all the answer that can be made ; fortunately, however, it requires but a moment of reflection to discover the truth. We have the reports and it is from them that the high percentage of the average attendance, already referred to, is made up. If the schools had not been regularly opened, that percentage would not have been as high as indicated. This is a striking fact, which nobody having the slightest experience in such matters, can controvert. Our opponents have felt the weakness of their position in this regard, and to get over it they have impudently insinuated that our reports were falsified. Should I go to the trouble of denying such a dastardly charge? Does it not strike you that if the charge was true it would have been exposed before this day? They have been very careful not to particularize their accusations. Why not give names, dates and other particulars? We never wanted to cover any misdoing. Many years ago some of our opponents tried that

kind of assault, but they were rebuked by the courts. Here let me quote the words of our distinguished solicitor, Mr. Ewart, a Protestant gentleman, as everybody must know :

Another specific charge is that under the old system the Catholics cooked their returns * * *. Upon the only occasion upon which it was made specific, it was proved to be untrue, and that in the most satisfactory way possible, namely, by the finding of the Court of Queen's Bench * * *. It was made as to the city of Winnipeg. It was proved to be false. Since then it has * * * taken to the woods.

That was the result of the inquiry. In addition to that I may mention a fact which will appear to you almost incredible. Some years ago, right in Winnipeg, Archbishop Taché was entered on the roll as a Protestant ratepayer. If that had happened with respect to a man less known than Mgr. Taché it could have been excused as a blunder. But Archbishop Taché was so widely known as the head of the Catholic Church in that part of the country, that the fact of his being entered as a Protestant ratepayer is most suggestive as to what may have happened in that respect with regard to other Catholic ratepayers not occupying such a prominent position. We refrain, however, from calling that a fraud; we prefer to believe in the honesty of the perpetrators of such blunders than to recriminate and to injure the character of our neighbours. These considerations have no weight, however, with our enemies. For them, there is nothing but dishonesty amongst Catholics from top to bottom, and they publish it and proclaim that it is out of interest for us that they do so. What a loving people they are! Be our brothers, say they to us, or we will knock you down.

Another accusation is that the priests were teaching, and illegally and fraudulently receiving money for their services. To this accusation also I give a flat denial. No priest has fraudulently or illegally received public money for teaching. Unorganized school districts could not and did not get any public money, so the priest could not get any either. In every organized school district there was a board of trustees in whose charge and control was the school. These trustees had by law the right of engaging the services of teachers, whether priests or laymen, and the moment those trustees had engaged their teachers and kept their schools in operation, they had

a legal right to their share of the taxes and public money. The fraud and the illegality would have been to refuse them that share of money. In all cases the money went to the school district, and not to the teachers, the latter being paid for their services by the school district, according to their engagement, and if in certain cases public money went direct to the teachers it was only on satisfactory evidence that the school district was owing them the amount. It was not a claim of the teachers as against the board, but a claim of the teachers as against the school district controlled by the trustees. That was the law, so that as a matter of fact the trustees were in this respect the controlling and responsible parties. The moment the latter were satisfied, the law had to take its effect. But now, hon. gentlemen, what are the facts about the priests teaching in schools? I am in a position to assert that within the ten years next preceding the year 1890, there had not been more than three or four priests who, occasionally, taught schools, and when they did, the circumstances were such that no other teachers could be got. They never received money as priests, although they may have received some as teachers from the trustees. And how long did they teach? Out of an aggregate, taken at the lowest figure, of 6,000 months of school teaching during these ten years, for the Catholic schools, the three or four priests, during the same period, were not employed for more, at the outside, than sixty months in the aggregate, that is, not more than one-hundredth of the time. Double that percentage, treble it, make it four times if you like, that would be only four-hundredths of the time. Is that sufficient to justify the storm that is now raging all over the Dominion, even if on some particular points certain deficiency might be found? Is it sufficient to deprive a whole section of the population of the rights it had on account of a few irregularities? If any irregularities did occur they were due rather to the force of circumstances than to any unwillingness or preconceived neglect of duty. I am sure, hon. gentlemen, that I do not in vain call your attention to the difficulties of a new province, with its sparse and far from well off population. There is an immense area of vacant lands. Day by day it is filling up. As soon as the settlers begin to form a group at a certain point,

they look for educational facilities. But times are hard ; the poor settlers have not yet recovered from the straitened circumstances in which they were when they came to our new land. Everything has to be done ; there is no money to build a school ; there is no money even to pay the teacher ; what will they do ? Just as other people do—the best they can. Under those circumstances the Catholic settlers go to their priest and request him to open a school at a sacrifice of time and money, in order not to let their youth grow up in ignorance. Will you blame them for that ? I am sure you will not. But outside of Parliament we find parties always accusing the Catholic clergy of keeping the people in ignorance ; the moment, however, a clergyman exerts himself to extend to his congregation the benefit of his own education and training, the moment he devotes himself to the work of imbuing the youth with a love of learning, religious and secular, the very same parties who accuse the church of keeping the people in ignorance, are down upon him and wish him to be excluded from the school-house. The three or four priests to whom I have referred did teach under the difficult circumstances that I have first mentioned. The localities were new, poor and remote ; sometimes the board had no qualified teachers to offer them ; the trustees and the people who had elected them, thought that the best and only thing they could do was to request their respective priests to open a school for their children ; these responded cheerfully, they did good work ; some times they were paid for it by their trustees not as priests, but as a teacher ; some times they were not, this time because they were priests and ready as such to make sacrifices that a layman would not do, and I stand by them here, and would like to be able to do more for them than to express my gratitude for the services they have rendered to the cause of education. One of those priests was Rev. Father Decorby, and you may judge of him by what my hon. friend from Shell River said in this House on the 23rd of April last :

In my immediate neighbourhood there is a separate school, named after the clergyman, Father Decorby, who founded it. He conducted a separate school there for years to which the Protestant population in its neighbourhood went. They were all satisfied with the school ; they had no complaints to make of it.

Yes, some priests did teach, occasionally, and under the peculiar circumstances I have

told. And why not ? The priest is an educated man. A man who has had at least eighteen years of study ; who was taught and has taught before being ordained ; he is a friend to the people, he lives amongst them partaking their poor bill of fare, and helping them in all the circumstances of life. The first school in our territories formerly known as the lone land was opened by a priest. When, at the request of Lord Selkirk, the great Bishop Plessis of Quebec sent the first missionaries to the Red River, here are some of the instructions be gave them :

6. Missionaries will take a particular care of christian education among children. And for this they will establish schools and catechism in all the localities they may have occasion to visit. * * *

The missionaries will establish their home near Fort Douglas, on the Red River, will build there a church, a house, a school. * * *

9. The missionaries will make known to the people the advantage they enjoy in remaining under the government of His British Majesty : will teach them by words and example the respect and fidelity they should have for the Sovereign ; will accustom them to offer to God fervent prayers for the prosperity of His Most Gracious Majesty, of His August family, and His empire. * * *

Pursuant to these instructions, a school was opened in 1818 at St. Boniface, by Rev. Mr. Provencher, afterwards Bishop Provencher. It has never ceased to exist since, and in 1859, the Hon. Mr. Taylor, a United States consul, and in 1869, Sir Charles Tupper, visiting the schools that had sprung out from that first one, could not refrain from expressing to His Grace Archbishop Taché, their great surprise at the excellence of the education given in our Catholic institutions at such a remote period. On account of these beginnings, if not on any other account, is not the priest, who has opened and maintained the first schools in the North-west entitled to some consideration ? I do not say that he should be allowed to break the law, but I do contend that when he comes to the rescue of the population, with a view of helping the latter to get over its difficulties, whether in matters of education or anything else, he should be praised instead of being vilified.

On account of the care extended to our schools by the clergy, and of our wishes to have Catholic prayers and religious instructions in them, the idea that our schools are church schools, seems to have taken root in the minds of too many of our fellow-countrymen. This is altogether a misapprehension. Our schools were not, and neither

are our schools in the provinces of Ontario or Quebec, church schools. Our schools in Manitoba were purely common schools, and public state schools, under the control of the lay authorities to the same extent as the Protestant schools were. In the Protestant schools of Quebec, it was decided in 1890, that they would have half an hour of religious instruction, and the *St. John News* (Quebec), a staunch supporter of the dissentient schools in Quebec, said in July, 1890 :

Friends of religious education will be glad to learn that the Protestant committee, at their last meeting at Quebec, decided that for the future the first half hour of every day's work in all the schools is to be invariably devoted to scriptural and religious training.

And this is a proper thing because, as the celebrated philosopher Bacon said : "Religion is the aroma which is necessary for the preservation of science; without the aroma, science would soon decay and dissolve itself."

Now, hon. gentlemen, that was exactly the rule in our Manitoba Catholic schools. The religious instruction did not last more than half an hour, sometimes less. Why should we be condemned for doing in Manitoba what is so good for Quebec Protestants? As to our relations towards the state, I can only repeat what I stated in this House last year :

Neither the church nor the parents have ever refused to the state its legitimate interference. Everybody is in accord in wishing a large and intelligent diffusion of knowledge. Taking into consideration the circumstances surrounding modern communities, the church and the parents admit the assistance of the state in that noble work. They admit that the state has an interest in the education of the people. They admit that the state has a right to see that the assistance given is not misapplied, they admit that the state has a right to exact a full compensation in the form of knowledge, outside of religious instruction, for the money they hand over to the parents to help the latter in the fulfilment of the duties imposed upon them by nature and their religious convictions. As a matter of fact, they only retain practically now-a-days the right of guiding the morals of their children, and of teaching them how to worship their God upon this earth. Thus understood, there is no inconsistency in our theory, there is no clashing between the rights of the parents and the rights of the state. On the contrary, there is a fruitful and harmonious accord which has its continual and delightful echoes in the hearts of all good citizens and brings them together and contributes to the national unity.

Let us now speak about our school-houses and their accommodation, for this also a cause of impeachment against our school

system. One is at a loss to understand why, supposing the school-houses were in an unfit condition, it should be necessary to remedy that state of things to overthrow the school system itself. It seems to me it is like a gentleman who would demolish his house because of a smoking chimney. However, that has been done, done unjustly, and without cause. In towns and cities we have, I venture to say, the finest buildings that can be found in the province for educational purposes. There are many hon. gentlemen here who have visited our country and who will not contradict me on this point. As to rural parts, our school buildings and accommodation were on a par at least with the accommodation offered to the Protestant children. Even in 1893 the Protestant schools had 64 log school-houses. I have myself travelled over the country, and I have come across school-houses, belonging to the Protestant section, which were isolated, filthy, ugly and unprovided with school appliances of any kind. To support my own testimony on this I will quote from reports of inspectors of the then Protestant schools. One inspector says in speaking of one school : "There are no maps, blackboard, or, in fact, apparatus of any kind." Speaking of another he says : "The furniture is very inferior." Elsewhere it is said : "The school is not very well supplied with apparatus." Another inspector speaks in the following way of one of the schools under his care : "It is a public hall used for all kinds of purposes, out of school hours, the result being that its condition, when so used, is altogether to unfit it for the work of a school." Another inspector expresses himself in this general way : "There are still a few cases in which the trustees expect the teachers to accomplish their work without giving them the necessary adjuncts in the way of good-sized blackboards, etc., in others the necessary maps have not been procured." Another says : "The progress of this school has been somewhat hindered by lack of proper accommodation." Speaking of another school the same inspector says : "This school has likewise suffered from poor accommodation." Another inspector speaks in this way : "In many cases the school-houses were not in as clean and tidy a condition as desirable. The teachers are largely to blame for this." Another says : "The school-house of this district is of inferior character." Another

again says: "The desks are utterly unsuitable for the purpose for which they are intended." Another speaks in his report of four districts where "log houses have been erected." I will stop making quotations, although I might add good many to the above. I cannot overlook, however, the fact that the census of 1891, as compiled in the statistical year-book of 1893 registers 619 log school-houses in Ontario, under the public school system. I repeat here that I am not referring to that for the pleasure of finding fault. Not at all. I do not find fault; my experience prevents me from doing so. I know that a good deal of forbearance has to be exercised in these matters, but am I not entitled to ask for the same forbearance on the part of the adherents to the so-called public school system when dealing with our Catholic schools, which are also public schools, and state schools? Among all our school-houses, I do not think there were more than four or five log houses. The others were all good frame buildings, well lighted, well closed, and provided with a complete set of maps, supplied to them through the care of the general board, and otherwise fit for the school work, although, however, devoid of any pretension to extravagance. General advice was given to our school districts not to run into debt. The consequence was that in 1890, at the time the change took place, the aggregate amount of debt incurred by the Catholic schools all over the province did not reach \$6,000, while the Protestant schools had an aggregate financial obligation amounting to about half a million of dollars. Again, I say, I do not find fault with that. It was their right, and we had nothing to say about it. But we may well find fault, when we are called upon to suffer on that account. The necessary results of so large an expenditure was to lead them to heavy assessments and taxation, heavier than those of the Catholics who had been more moderate in their administration. And now comparisons are made between our light assessments and their heavy assessments; these heavy assessments are now brought before the public in big letters, and not only public sympathy is appealed to, but these heavy assessments are given without any explanations, as an instance of the alleged unfair working of the old system. An attempt is made to impress upon the minds of the public that because Catholics are assessed for less than the Pro-

testants, there must have been in that old system something radically wrong and unjust, and that Protestants were paying their money to us, which is not the case. As a matter of fact, it is simply the result of a difference in the principles laid down in the administration of affairs, one section, the Catholic section, cautiously guarding themselves against indebtedness, the other, the Protestant section, running heavily into debt. And now, to use that as an argument against us, and to use that as a reason for wiping us out, is unjust in the extreme. We should not be called upon to suffer in any way on account of that; we should not be called upon to help others out of their difficulties; we should not be punished for any action or state of things with which we had nothing to do, and as to which we are under no responsibility at all. Here are other reasons why the Catholic taxation was not so heavy as that of the Protestants. The Catholic people were enjoying in school accommodation, scattered over the province, and otherwise, advantages to the amount of over \$100,000, for which the Catholic rate-payers had not had, and will never have to assess themselves. From whom did that money come? It came from that clergy which is now branded as an enemy of education and of the people; it came principally from the illustrious and grand prelate whom God, in his mercy called away from this world last year, and whom I have seen sobbing and shedding tears at the idea that after his fifty years of labour for his people—for Canada, for England, in a land where the Catholic missionaries had been called by Lord Selkirk to ensure peace and morality in the colony, in a land where he had himself been called by the Canadian and Imperial authorities to restore good feelings and harmony at a critical period of the history of Manitoba, in a land where the Catholics have been the pioneers of Christianity and of education—whose eyes, I say, I saw weeping, whose heart I felt throbbing in his bosom at the idea that all these labours, all these sacrifices, and the aim of his life would be frustrated, and that on the eve of taking his departure he had to leave his beloved flock trembling under the threats with which Christian education was assailed. And now, hon. gentlemen, since I have introduced the name of our lamented Archbishop Taché, I may just as well use his own words to let you know another reason why our taxations

is less heavy than it would otherwise be. His Grace says :

I naturally admit that high price is one of the ways to secure the services of well qualified persons for teaching, and it seems to be the only resource at the command of our Protestant friends. Over and aside of this ordinary way of securing good teachers, the Catholics have an advantage that they highly appreciate, and which is not entirely despised by Protestants of standing and enlightenment. The advantage I allude to is the one secured by the valuable services of persons who do not teach for the sake of money or for making a living out of it, but who do teach as a sacred duty towards God and society, and who teach either for nothing or for the small amount barely giving them food and clothing.

This consideration goes a long way against taxation, and is another factor of the difference which exists between the two sections of our school system. Any person will admit that this does no harm to Protestants, while it does a great deal of good to Catholics. The raising of the salary of these teachers would undoubtedly increase the taxation among the Catholics, but would in no way diminish that of the Protestants, and the cause of education would gain nothing by it.

Ideas on this topic are so erroneous among some people that saving expenses to ratepayers with regard to teachers, means poor teaching. Some men seem to ignore completely that there were, there are and will be thousands and thousands of the very best qualified teachers who never received and will never receive one dollar from any government grant or any assessment levied on ratepayers.

I will examine else where some of the ideas suggested by what has just been above stated, but it is undeniable that as far as money is concerned, the teachers who ask less are a saving resource to the ratepayers, and to tabulate complete statistics, the saving thus effected ought to be taken into consideration ; and while raising a cry among the Protestants because of their assessment with regard to school, fairness would require to state all the reasons why it is so.

To these lines I will only add this : The low percentage of the salary of the teachers is accountable for the fact that a good many of our teachers belonged to religious orders, requiring very little to live, free from the social displays bearing sometimes so heavily on laymen, and teaching, not for the salaries they could earn, but in obedience to their vows. In St. Boniface, for instance, for the sum of \$2,500 we secured the services of twelve qualified teachers, who supplied not only the tuition, but the building themselves, leaving to the trustees no other charge than that required for furniture and school apparatus. Considering that matter outside of any feeling or principle, but merely as a matter of business, everybody must admit that we cannot be blamed for availing ourselves of that advantage, which does not

affect in any way the position of our friends of the other section. It is not necessary to insist any more upon the causes of the disproportion in the rate of taxation that existed as between Catholic and Protestant. That disproportion existed, to a certain extent, but it was not due to the school system itself ; it was due to causes originating in ourselves, from our Catholic organization, and it did not increase the rate of taxation amongst Protestants : in fact it did not affect it in one way or the other. There was no injustice consequently. This, however, was made one of the arguments for the promoting of the change of the law. And then, not only was the rate of taxation, but the distribution of the government grant also, advanced as a grievance against us. It was contended that we received more than our share of that money. The contention cannot stand for a moment. Figures have been adduced to sustain that assertion. "Experts in figures and even muddlers of figures can arrange them so as to prove quite different propositions. But there is one thing which in this instance cannot be used to deceive any one ; it is the text of the law itself, which I will quote and which will show to the satisfaction of all that it was impossible that we should receive more than our equitable share. First as to taxation : the law provides that "in no case shall a Protestant ratepayer be obliged to pay for a Catholic school or a Catholic ratepayer for a Protestant school." It shows that no Protestant money could be levied for the support of Catholics, and if any was the Protestant ratepayer had the means of protecting himself. It is, clear, therefore, that when it was asserted that the money of the Protestant section of the community was taken to build up our schools or our religious denomination, it is obviously groundless, in so far at least as taxation was concerned. As a matter of fact, I do not remember one single case in which the Protestants did make any complaints in this matter. Let us see now as to public money, the money voted by the legislature. That distribution of money was based upon the census of the school population taken yearly in the month of November.

Under the law neither the Protestant section nor the Catholic section had anything to do with the apportionment of the money. We had only to hand over the census returns, and it became the duty and the

privilege of the government only to apportion the money. The majority of the government was Protestant. Is it to be believed that they were handing over to us an unfair proportion or one cent more than we were entitled to. During all the time I have been connected with education matters in Manitoba the Catholics never questioned the apportionment. I never heard that the Protestant section did. We were then getting along so harmoniously that it did not occur to our minds, on either side, that any injustice in that respect would be done to either section. Comparisons have been indulged in by some parties to show that we received more money than our share. But these comparisons are misleading. For instance, the number of schools have been taken as a basis, and it has been contended that our schools received more, each, than the Protestant schools. Without going much into figures I will show in a very brief way that this is entirely misleading. First, the law does not say that the division shall be made according to the number of schools, but according to the school population, and very properly so, because it is quite possible to understand that if the money was to be apportioned according to the number of schools, the result would be a tendency to unduly increase the number of schools; in some cases, it might go far beyond the requirements of population. This being the law, it follows that the only fair basis for comparison is the school population. At any rate, it was the law. Any other is beyond the pale of propriety. Secondly, the expenses of the Protestant section were much larger than the expenses of the Catholic section, as the following table will show:

Protestant section. Catholic section.		
1884.....	\$11,831 00	\$2,720 68
1885.....	12,816 00	2,064 64
1886.....	13,523 00	1,804 55
1887.....	16,992 00	2,724 10
Total.....	\$35,162 00	\$9,309 97

The larger the expenses are, the less there is to go to the schools; and less expense leaves more for the schools. This contingency again shows that the number of schools cannot be a proper basis for comparison.

Thirdly: Our Catholic population is not so scattered generally as the non-Catholic population; the consequence is that for a given area, we need fewer schools, although having more children. A group of 15 children

would require a school, but if within the same territory there are 40 children, it would require no greater school accommodation. If you apply that to the whole province you will find that for the same school population, there will be less schools for the section whose members are more grouped, and a greater number for the section whose members are more scattered. Such was the position of respective sections in our province.

And such being the case, it is improper to submit figures to show that our schools, each individually, received more than the Protestant schools. It is not the number of schools that are to be benefitted, but the number of children. That was the law and the law was based on a sound principle. In matters of taxation, all who pay should share equally. In a country, every soul is supposed to contribute its share to the public treasury and to receive an equal share in some form or other of the advantages offered by the state to its population. In matters of education the subsidies should be paid, as they were in our province, according to the school population, and not according to the number of schools, the absence or the existence of these being subject to too many contingencies to afford a sure and equitable ground of distribution. Rev. Dr. Bryce, who is to-day, and has been from the beginning, one of our strongest opponents, wrote in 1877:

The government grant is voted for one system of school, and is divided according to the population of children. No special rights are given to either Catholics or Protestants. All moneys are equitably distributed.

What could be asked more than equity in distribution? To-day there is no equitable distribution; it goes all to one party.

Before leaving this money subject, I must refer to an imputation which was put in circulation with the view of casting doubts on the honour of our board as to the management of the school money. As stated briefly in the former part of these remarks, we had, in 1889, a reserve fund of nearly \$14,000 which had accumulated year after year. That was a surplus we had to our credit. But strange as it may appear, there are parties who can never be satisfied. They do not like deficits, and they equally find fault when there is a surplus. We had a surplus, and we have been severely taken to task for it. We have been even accused of misap-

propriation of funds. The facts are as follows, as put before the public once by Archbishop Taché :

The 90th clause of the school law say :

" Each section of the board may reserve for unforeseen contingencies a sum not exceeding ten per cent of its share of the appropriation." Such is the law, it may seem very foolish to some as it seemed tolerably wise to others ; at all events the Catholic section being empowered by the law, took that course and reserved for unforeseen contingencies a sum a little less than ten per cent of its share of the different appropriations. But why have they done so ? The answer is this : from the beginning of the province it was found, and the experience is not altogether altered at this date, that the teachers of our schools, besides the insufficiency of their salaries, had often to serve a full term of five months before receiving anything on account of their salary, and after the terms were over, sometimes they had to wait two months and more before their well earned wages were paid, this seemed a great inconvenience which could only be remedied, and in fact was remedied, in having a reserve fund. The moment an account became due and approved by the section of the board, the superintendent paid it out of the reserve fund, and when the government thought it convenient to give an instalment of the voted money, it was deposited in the bank to fill up again or increase the reserve fund, and so forth from term to term and from instalment to instalment. By acting that way, the section of the board avoided what is always unpleasant, to apply repeatedly to the government officers and many times to be delayed by them.

They avoided also which is of more grave consequence, the painful obligation of delaying the payment of the money due to the teachers and others who had served the cause of education. If this is a fault I accept the responsibility, as chairman of the Catholic section of the board of education ; but I cannot abstain from stating, that a government, which would find such a condition of affairs in all the state departments when it is explicitly authorized by the law should easily acquiesce in the results it has brought about. This is called "misappropriation" by certain parties and the remittance of this reserve fund is also, with bad taste, called "disgorging," but I trust that the fair play and the good sense of the public will give the action of the Catholic section of the board in this matter, its true appellation and will view it in its proper light.

So all this transaction was according to an express law ; there was no misappropriation ; there was no secrecy about it. It was known to the public, to the legislature and the government, through our yearly reports ; it was known especially to the latter on account of one of their members having a seat on our board. The same thing had occurred in the Protestant section of the board, which, for a number of years had also unexpended balances ranging from \$4,000 to nearly \$10,000 constituting, as much as our unexpended

balance, a reserve fund. No blame has been cast on the Protestant section of the board for holding it ; and very properly holding it, in my opinion. But why should the Catholics be blamed for the same act ? Some may think that it would have been more advisable to spend the whole subsidy yearly and leave no balance. I think his grace Archbishop Taché gave good reasons for the course that was taken then, and to those reasons, I may add another one which some of the members had in their minds. It was expected that by this yearly increase of that reserve fund, a time would come when, with the interest thereon, we would be in a position to maintain, without any extra cost to the province, and without curtailing the allowance to the schools, a normal school for male teachers. We were providing for the future. However, I am quite prepared to recognize that an honest divergence of opinion may exist with regard to this matter. But even if it was unadvisable, there was no necessity to wipe out the whole Catholic school system to enforce another course. Mere representations would have been sufficient. I have stated to you the facts as to the part played by our section of the board in this matter. Let me now put before you the action of the local government with regard to the same matter. On the 12th July, 1889, Mr. Prendergast, then Provincial Secretary, wrote, on behalf of the government of which he was a member, to the Catholic Superintendent of Education, a letter, supported on no legal ground, by which a remittance of our reserve fund to the government was asked for. In that letter, however, he said, speaking on behalf of the government :

This demand refers only to a detail of internal administration, and in no way to the ownership of the amount in question ; such amount is decidedly vested right and will not admit of a doubt at any time.

This is a clear and positive acknowledgment on the part of the government that the Catholics could not be dispossessed of that amount, and a promise that they would not be dispossessed. On its receipt that communication was taken into consideration by the board, and, although there was no law upon which the government could at that time exact the remittance of that money, it was decided for the sake of conciliation to comply with the demand. So, on the 22nd day of July, ten days only after

the requisition had been made, the money was handed over to the government, with a resolution stating the rights and the views of the board. In spite of the promise of the government we have since been deprived of that money. I beg leave to put before the Senate a document which is an official statement of the transaction. It is a copy of the report of a committee of the Catholic section of the Board of Education to take into consideration the question of the reserve fund:

Since the year 1873, and until amended by chapter XXXI, 51 Vic. (1888) the School Acts of this province authorized each section of the Board of Education to reserve for contingencies a sum not exceeding ten per cent of the annual grants.

Clause 90 read as follows:

"* * * Each section of the board may reserve for unforeseen contingencies a sum not exceeding ten per cent of its share of the appropriation."

By virtue of that clause the Catholic section of the Board of Education had yearly, until 1888, put aside certain sums of money, which amounted (including the interest), in July, 1889, to \$13,879.47, as follows:—

Capital	\$11,756 57
Interest	2,122 90
Total	<u>\$13,879 47</u>

By chapter XXXI, 51 Vict. the law was changed, and the annual school appropriation, which used to be paid over to each section of the Board of Education, was ordered to be placed "to the credit of said respective boards in accounts to be opened in the books of the treasury department, and in the audit office." This enactment was for future action. But no provision was ever made affecting moneys previously paid to the board, and still in their hands. Consequently, the Catholic section of the Board of Education continued to retain and administer their accumulated reserve fund until July, 1889, when the government demanded that all moneys still in the hands of the board be paid over to the Provincial Treasury Department.

In making this demand the hon. Provincial Secretary stated, that the ownership of said money was entirely vested in our section of the Board of Education, and could not at any future time be questioned.

Although the Catholic section of the Board of Education were then of opinion, as they are now, that this demand had no ground in law, still they complied with the desire of the government and the above sum of \$13,879.47 was paid over to the provincial treasurer, the board, however, reserving the rights of the Catholic schools of this province to such money, as may be seen by the resolution which was transmitted to the government with the cheque, and which is as follows:—

"In compliance with the desire of the government as expressed in the letter of the hon. Provincial Secretary, dated 12th July, 1889, the Catholic section of the Board of Education gives authority to the superintendent to hand over to the Provincial Treasurer the sum of \$13,879.47 being

the whole of the reserve fund and the balance of all school moneys in their hands.

"In making this remittance, the Catholic section of the Board of Education beg leave to represent:

"1. This reserve fund has originated and accrued by virtue of the provisions of the various school Acts then in force in this province.

"2. Only self sacrifice on the part of the members of this section of the Board of Education and their adherence to the strictest economy in the administration of school moneys have rendered possible the creation of such a reserve fund.

"The ownership of that fund is a vested right in the Catholic schools of this province; therefore, those who have had to administer the same up to the present time are convinced that the government will not change the destination of said money and will not either decrease the ordinary grants, such being the assurance given us by the government in the above mentioned letter of the hon. Provincial Secretary."

The above resolution was transmitted to the government, with the cheque on the 22nd July, 1889. The receipt of such resolution and cheque was duly acknowledged by the government. Since then the Catholic section of the Board of Education has received no intimation that the amount of said reserve fund was no more at their disposition. Up to the present time, no legislation has deprived this board of their actual right to distribute said amount to the Catholic schools. Accordingly it has been resolved by said board that said amount shall now be distributed and paid over to all the Catholic schools of this province, according to the requirements of subsection (c) of sec. 90, of the School Act, as amended by sec. 7 of chap. xxxi., 51 Vic. the allotment between all schools being as follows:

Then followed a list of apportionments. The whole was duly transmitted to the government before the coming into force of the said Acts. The answer is yet to come. We know, however, that the amount has gone to the consolidated fund of the province. The funds, which had been acknowledged by the government to be ours, have been taken possession of by the same government, and used for other purposes than those for which they had been voted. If anybody is to be accused of misappropriation of funds in connection with this transaction, the Catholic section is not that party. We have been dispossessed of an amount of money to which our schools had a vested right; the lawful requisition made by our board for the payment of that money to our schools was not acted upon by the government; the money has gone to the consolidated funds, that is, has been used for other purposes than for what it had been voted that is spoliation, that spoliation was perpetrated by force, there being at the time no law in existence giving even a shadow of right to the government to lay their hands upon it. In con-

nection with this I must refer to an incident which took place last week in the Local Legislature of Manitoba. In the debate on the remedial order, the hon. Mr. Cameron, the provincial secretary, is reported as having said that our section of the Board of Education handed over that money to the government without any protest. I am at a loss to understand how a man holding the responsible position of an adviser of the Crown, speaking from his seat in the legislature, could deliberately mislead public opinion to that extent. The Government of Manitoba acknowledged in the letter conveying their demand to us, that we had a vested right in that sum, there was, it seems to me no necessity for a protest. But, as a matter of fact, we did protest, the resolution and official documents which I have placed here before the Senate cannot be questioned. And what are they, if not courteous, but at the same time strong protests? And if in the presence of these facts and of such action on our part, the Government of Manitoba, being in possession of the documents to which I have just referred, have the audacity to impose upon the public as in this instance, then what reliance, I ask, can be put upon their declarations or accusations? I may safely say that those people are going beyond what decency permits when they accuse the Catholics of having used Protestant money for the support their schools. The very opposite has been the rule since 1889. I hasten to add that I know personally a great many of our Protestant fellow-countrymen who are exceedingly sorry on that account. In Winnipeg some of them said that they were ashamed of being placed in the position of using the money of the Catholic ratepayers to educate their children. They look for a change. They look for a remedy that will relieve them from that uncomfortable position. I hope the remedy will not be long delayed. I hope also that this effort of mine will help to dispel many misapprehensions, and clear the way to such a mutual understanding as will restore harmony in the province.

I have gone I think over all the grounds of accusation against our schools. I might have said much more in their justification. I am sure, however, that I have furnished a sufficient justification to all fair-minded men to enable them to shake off any prejudices they might have had with regard to such schools. I have gone, to a limited extent, beyond the course that Catholics generally take with

respect to other schools. As I have already said, we do not as a rule concern ourselves about the schools of non-Catholic people. We are willing and satisfied to let them have the schools they like under their own control. We have lately been assailed, however, with such violence, with such a disregard for our feelings and in such a slanderous way that we were bound to take up the gauntlet and show how easy it would be to retaliate, in case it would be necessary to adopt such a course. But I protest here that my intention has not been to make any reflection on men, on institutions, on schools or on any school system whatever, not being in accord with my own views. I have experience enough in this matter to know what difficulties of every sort are to be met with every day in the management of schools and in the improvements wished for. But, hon. gentlemen, why should we not have the benefit of the forbearance we are ready to exercise towards others? There may be some differences of view as to the methods of teaching; there may be some divergence of opinion as to the relative importance of the various subjects to be taught. But, because of these differences, because some people may think that one subject should be more largely taught than others, it is no reason why one system should be considered as inferior to another; it is no reason for saying that the instruction given in one school is not the equivalent of that given in another school. Let us illustrate these propositions by taking the history of men of different intellectual attainments. Take Shakespeare and Newton. The intellectual attainments of these two men were as widely different as can be imagined. But who will undertake to say that one was superior to the other? Each one was a superior mind, had accomplished training in his way, and the surest judgment to be pronounced with regard to them is to proclaim that both were men of genius, of whom the whole human kind has reason to be proud. In the same way we should mutually have regard for our neighbours. Why not be generous on both sides, and since we cannot agree in matters pertaining to religious and educational matters, why not agree to disagree and direct our energies to the material and national development of the immense resources of our country in a spirit of liberty and common loyalty to the flag that protects us? In that way we would hear no more, on either side, of these vexed

questions. When, hon. gentlemen, the brave soldiers of England went to the front at Waterloo or at Balaklava, the English people did not ask those gallant warriors whether they knew how to write or read. Neither was that question put to the Canadian militia when they saved Canada to England. In all these cases the British crown and the British people did not hesitate to acknowledge the services of the troops, and that they had well merited the gratitude of the Empire. Should unfortunately, such occasions as those occur again, the same fidelity and the same gallantry would be found amongst the children of the Canadian nation, whether they would have been taught by a first class or a third class certificated teacher, whether by a nun or by a layman, and in view of that, the war that is raging against the Catholics, their conscience, their views, their children and their liberty of conscience, should be stopped. These last words may seem rather strong to some, but they did not seem too strong to Sir A. T. Galt when the education of the Protestants of Quebec was at stake. Here are his words :

It must be clear that a measure would not be favourably entertained by the minority in Lower Canada which would place the education of the children and the provision for their schools wholly in the hands of a majority of a different faith. It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local legislature it was absolutely necessary that it should be accompanied by such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done. Now, this applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied, and with equal force, to Upper Canada and the other provinces, for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Roman Catholic minority. The same privileges belong to the one of right here as belonged to the other of right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

This is put in the most stringent form, the reverse of the assumption that the state can do what it likes with persons and estates, particularly when it comes to education. This latter doctrine is false in itself, full of dangers for the commonwealth, and repudiated by political economy and by statesmen.

John Stuart Mill who was an advanced Liberal said in his *Essay on Liberty* :

That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in state-hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character and diversity in opinions and modes of

conduct involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general state education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another, and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in government * * * or the majority of the existing generation * * * it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body.

Further on he adds :

One thing must be strenuously insisted on: that the government must claim no monopoly for its education, either in lower or in the higher branches, must exert neither authority nor influence to induce the people to resort to its teachers in preference to others, and must confer no peculiar advantages on those who have been instructed by them.

It is not endurable that a government should, either in law or in fact, have a complete control over the education of the people.

Gladstone said on the 24th June, 1870 :

As regards the existing denominational schools, it is a very grave and important question which we have to ask ourselves—whether we are frankly, ungrudgingly, willingly and systematically to make use of that powerful agency for the purpose of good secular instruction, which is placed at our command in a great degree, if not exclusively, through the vigorous actions of religious zeal and love? Let us not disguise from ourselves that this is a question of the greatest moment. The answer to it, I own, appears to me to be perfectly clear. The answer is, that nothing but folly could induce us to refuse to avail ourselves of an opportunity so valuable.

This is the opinion of the former great leader of the Liberal party in England. Let us see now the opinion of the leader of the Conservative party, Lord Salisbury.

Speaking at Preston, some time in the fall of 1893, Lord Salisbury said :

Numbers of persons have invented what I may call a patent compressible religion, which can be forced into all consciences with a very little squeezing: and they wish to insist that this should be the only religion taught throughout the schools of the nation. What I want to impress upon you is that if you admit this conception, you are entering upon a religious war of which you will not see the end. There is only one sound principle in religious education to which you should cling, which you should relentlessly enforce against all the conveniences and experiences of official men: and that is that a parent, unless he has forfeited the right by criminal acts, has the inalienable right to determine the teaching which the child shall receive upon the holiest and most momentous of subjects. That is a right which no expediency can negative, which no state necessity ought to allow you to sweep away; and therefore I ask you to give your attention to this question of denominational education. It is full of danger and of difficulty; but you will only meet the danger by marching straight up to it, and declaring that the prerogative of the parent, unless he be convicted of criminality, must not be taken away by the state.

Such is the way in which Lord Salisbury vindicates the rights of parents, the influence of religious truth in education, and defines the rights of the state. I find in the *Owl*, February, 1895, on page 292, the following :

Mr. Gladstone says : In my opinion which I have endeavoured to recently set forth in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, an undenominational system of religion, framed by or under the authority of the state is a moral monster. The state has no charter from heaven such as may belong to the church or the individual conscience.

An independent paper, and also a pillar of Protestantism in Quebec, the *St. Johns News*, says :

With regard to the separate schools we have little reliable information ; they may be mismanaged, or they may not ; they may be doing efficient work or not ; but it strikes us that granting all that is said against the schools of the minority in Manitoba, some less drastic remedy than their total abolition might be applied. We have the separate school system in our own province, and it is only just to say that it has worked, on the whole, equitably, and to the satisfaction of both the great divisions of christendom, yet if such a system depended merely on the will of the majority of the hour, and not on that higher principle faintly expressed in the words of the governor-general to which so much exception has been taken in certain quarters, "Live and let live," what security would the Protestant minority of Quebec have that their schools would not be done away with, and the whole system of education be made a state affair ? The equal-rights agitators clamour for a separation of state and church in this province, but in Manitoba they are working for a union of state and education which is still more objectionable.

But apart from all selfish considerations, the question of separate schools rests on a firmer basis, that of justice. It is not right that the minority should be compelled to send their children to schools controlled by the majority, or let them go without education altogether in many cases. It is not right that the state should intervene and say, there shall be no dissentient schools. In fact, so far as the great majority of dissentient schools in this province are concerned, we may say that they would infinitely prefer to do without the state's subvention if the state, on its part, would relinquish all pretensions of control. Of course there are some institutions that get the lion's share, but the subsidies extended to the rest are merely nominal—\$20 to \$30 a year to an elementary, \$25 to \$50 to a model school ; in return for which the

state issues it diplomas to teachers (who have to pay for them) fixes the standard of work, examines the scholars, and mules the teachers so much a year willing or unwilling, for a pension fund. In our opinion, the state gets more than it pays for.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my statement that the question of efficiency or inefficiency of the Catholic schools does not and cannot come in here. In 1890, the local government could have made an investigation. They did not do so. They went on destroying the system that had been in existence for twenty years. To-day it is too late. That suggestion is evidently a side issue to prolong this irritating contest and to avoid their submission to the highest authority in the land. This federal government cannot accept that suggestion. The action of the local government has forced the subject upon us. They have created the situations described by the lamented D'Arcy McGee in the following words pronounced in London (Ontario) in 1866, and they will have to receive the treatment indicated also in those lines. D'Arcy McGee then said :

The minorities east and west have really nothing to fear beyond what already existed, local irritations produced by ill-disposed individuals. The strong arm and the long arm of the confederate power will be extended over them all, and woe be to the wretch on whom that arm shall have to descend in anger for any violation of the federal compact.

True it is to be regretted most sincerely that such things have happened, but since the difficulties are thrown in our way, since there are wretched people who set the federal and Imperial authorities at defiance, in violation of the rights conferred on an important section of the country, let the arm, the long arm of the confederate power descend upon the guilty parties, so that it may be said that in the Dominion of Canada justice is never refused to those whose grievances have been so strongly, so clearly, and so authoritatively pointed out and determined as those of the Catholics of Manitoba have been by the final judgment of the Privy Council in London, and by the remedial order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council of Canada.

BIBLIOTHEQUE
SAINT-SULPICE